



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

STRATEGIC PLANNING IN A UNIVERSITY FACULTY

BY

JIN HUA WANG

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA

SPRING, 1991



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-66818-0

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: JIN HUA WANG

TITLE OF THESIS: STRATEGIC PLANNING IN A UNIVERSITY FACULTY

DEGREE: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1991

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purpose only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Jin Hua Wang

Permanent Address:

Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Canada T6G 2G5

DATE: April 4, 1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Strategic Planning in a University Faculty" submitted by Jin Hua Wang in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

M. Haughey
M. Haughey, Supervisor

D. A. MacKay
D. A. MacKay

R. G. McIntosh
R. G. McIntosh

E. W. Ratsoy
E. W. Ratsoy

L. S. Beauchamp
L. S. Beauchamp

N. L. Hersom
N. L. Hersom, External Examiner

Date: *April 4, 1991*

ABSTRACT

This case study investigated the planning process whereby a university faculty designed and implemented its Strategic Planning Project. The major question which guided this study was: On what basis did the Faculty decide to initiate the Strategic Planning Project and how was it carried out? Specifically, what factors influenced the initiation, design and structure of the Project, what approaches and procedures were used, who was involved and what were the major outcomes of the Strategic Planning Project?

The methodological basis for this research involved an interpretive approach within the naturalistic paradigm. Respondents internal and external to the Faculty provided historical information and described their involvement in and their reflections about the Strategic Planning Project through in-depth, tape-recorded interviews. Concurrently, a thorough document review was conducted to inform the interview process. The findings were reported within the framework of the Strategic Planning Project: Rationale, Design, Structure, Procedures, Involvement, and Outcomes.

The major finding of this study was that the model of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was "strategic planning" in title, but traditional planning in practice. Findings of this study also included the emergence of four major issues in relation to the literature on strategic planning: Models: Strategic Planning versus Traditional Planning; Leadership: Aspiration versus Actuality; Involvement: Participation versus Frustration; and Culture: Institutional versus Strategic. To make strategic planning successful, the chief administrators must understand the differences between traditional planning and strategic planning, have a full commitment to strategic planning, encourage wide participation, and develop an appropriate culture to support strategic planning. The major barriers were also identified as: the influence of the concepts of traditional planning, leadership styles and skills, the lack of strategies to motivate faculty participation, and institutional inertia and the traditions of the university.

Implications for practice indicate that chief administrators of higher educational institutions should develop a thorough understanding of the role of strategic planning so as to build a strategic culture which fits the institutional culture, keep the balance between centralized decision-making and participative decision-making, employ different strategies and incentives to encourage faculty participation, and involve line administrators, when applying the strategic planning approach at their institutions. Implications for future research include multi-site comparative studies, the impact of organizational culture on strategic planning initiatives, strategies for faculty involvement and the importance of leadership in successful strategic planning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A Chinese proverb says: "The cleverest chef cannot cook a meal without rice." Undoubtedly, without many people who provided me with enough rice--generous participation, willing involvement, enthusiastic cooperation, and supportive guidance, I could not have cooked this meal--the completion of this dissertation. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to the individuals who participated in this study for their willingness to share their knowledge and expertise during the interviews and their generosity in providing additional information beyond the interview guides. Although all those participants must remain anonymous, any breath of life found in this dissertation belongs to them.

This study could not have been undertaken without the constant support and encouragement of my adviser and dissertation supervisor, Dr. M. Haughey. Her thoughtful and consistent guidance, wise and considerate challenge, critical and astute insights, and inspiring and witty humor have made the study process enjoyable and challenging.

Throughout my doctoral study, Dr. E. W. Ratsoy, Dr. D. A. MacKay, and Dr. R. G. McIntosh have provided valuable suggestions, constructive feedback, and perceptive questions. Their outstanding scholarship and expertise have inspired me to make this study a success. Dr. L. Beauchamp has served on the committee, expended his time generously, and offered challenging thoughts and encouraging comments. It was my great honor to have Dr. N. L. Hersom, the President of Mount Saint Vincent University, as the external examiner.

I extend special thanks to Dr. E. A. Holdaway for his initial encouragement to conduct this study, and also, to Dr. D. Richards for helping me transfer interview data from one computer program to another. I am especially grateful to the Dean of Education, Dr. R. S. Patterson and the Coordinators of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning

Project, Dr. E. Ingram and Dr. J. Worth for allowing me to access to the Project documents and for the innumerable informal discussions regarding the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project.

I am immensely grateful to my friend, Dr. D. Haughey and to my fellow doctoral students: Don Hall, Donna Smith, and Neville Highett, for their unfailing assistance and inspiration.

Acknowledgement and appreciation are extended to the Department of Educational Administration for offering me financial assistance during the period of my doctoral program.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my family members on both sides of the Pacific Ocean: my grandmother, my parents, my aunt, my wife and my son. They always share hardships and happiness with me, any success of mine is also theirs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	Page
OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	1
Introduction.....	1
The Context of the Study.....	3
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms	6
Delimitations and Limitations	7
Delimitations	7
Limitations	7
Organization of Thesis.....	8
 CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
Introduction.....	9
Strategic Planning in Business.....	9
The Rise of Strategic Planning.....	9
The Normative Model of Strategic Planning	10
The Instrumental Characteristics.....	12
The Symbolic Characteristics	14
Key Issues in Strategic Planning	15
Research on Strategic Planning in Business	17
Summary	19
Strategic Planning in Higher Education.....	19
The Application of Strategic Planning in Higher Education.....	20

Differences between Traditional Planning and Strategic Planning.....	22
Need for Strategic Planning in Higher Education	23
Model of Strategic Planning in Higher Education	25
Issue Management in Strategic Planning	26
Research on Strategic Planning in Higher Education	30
Summary	35
Commentary	37

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY	42
Introduction	42
Interpretive Paradigm	42
Case Study Approach.....	43
Methodology and Data Collection	45
Documentary Data.....	45
Interviews.....	46
Processing and Interpreting Data.....	48
Research Trustworthiness.....	50
Ethical Considerations.....	51
Summary	52

CHAPTER IV

RATIONALE, DESIGN, AND STRUCTURE.....	53
Introduction	53
Rationale for the Project	54
Impact of University Strategic Planning and PACCR Study.....	54
Political and Stakeholder Demands.....	57

Financial and Economic Pressures	58
Social, Demographic, and Technological Trends.....	59
To Create an Impetus for Change	60
To Build Faculty Level Commitment	61
To Develop a Consensus on Faculty's Mission	63
A Possible Hidden Agenda.....	63
Design of the Project.....	65
Faculty of Education Self-Study.....	65
Faculty of Education Planning Study	67
Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project.....	70
The Structure of the Project	74
The Overall Structure	74
The Role of the Dean.....	76
The Role of the Project Coordinator	78
The Role of the Department Chairs.....	79
Communication with Faculty	83
Summary	84

CHAPTER V

PROCEDURES, INVOLVEMENTS, AND OUTCOMES	85
Introduction	85
Phase 1: Internal Review and Environmental Examination.....	85
Studying Current Status and Trends	86
Reviewing Literature on Issues in Teacher Education	90
Phase 2: Issue Identification	93
Gathering Reactions through Interviews	94
Identifying Issues by Panel	99

Clarifying Issues through Seminar	101
Confirming Issues Through Feedback Forums.....	104
Phase 3: Alternatives for Issue Resolution	108
Selecting Task Force and Study Team Leaders and Members	108
Formulating Mission, Goals, and Priorities.....	111
Developing Teacher Education Models	115
Developing Alternative Structures and Procedures	118
Developing Faculty Role in Graduate Studies and Research.....	120
Interactions among Task Forces and Study Teams.....	122
Reporting Procedural Outcomes.....	124
Exploring and Mapping the Future of the Faculty.....	125
Reflecting upon the Final Report	129
Phase 4: Action Planning.....	132
Planning for Action	133
Encouraging More Involvement	135
Examining Two Task Force Reports.....	136
Expectations and Concerns for the Project's Future	138
Summary	141

CHAPTER VI

REFLECTIONS IN RELATION TO THE LITERATURE.....	143
Introduction	143
Model: Strategic Planning versus Traditional Planning.....	143
Leadership: Aspiration versus Actuality	155
Involvement: Participation versus Frustration	169
Culture: Institutional versus Strategic.....	180
Summary	191

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, REFLECTIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.....	192
Introduction.....	192
Summary of the Study.....	192
Statement of the Problem.....	192
Research Design and Methodology.....	193
Findings of the Study.....	193
Personal Reflections	210
Implications for Practice.....	215
Implications for Further Research.....	217
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 219
Appendix 1: Gaining Entry	230
Appendix 2: Consent Form.....	232
Appendix 3: Preliminary Interview Guide.....	234
Appendix 4: Chronology of Events	237
Appendix 5: Letter Concerning Member Check.....	241
Appendix 6: Topics/Themes from Interviews	243

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Baldrige and Deal (1983) point out that the most stable fact about organizations is that they change. Change can mean a major overhaul or a cosmetic afterthought, a substantive renovation or a lively ritual, a response to crisis or an opportunity for excitement and adventure (pp. 1-3).

Goodman (1982) categorizes organizational change along two dimensions: planned change and adaptation. Planned change, which is designed to effect a transformation of the organization, attempts to manage events so that the outcome is redirected by design towards some predetermined goals. Adaptation brings an evolutionary perspective to how certain organizations adapt to their changed environments and survive while others fail over a particular stretch of time.

The environments of universities and colleges have become not only increasingly turbulent since the 1980s but also more tightly interconnected, thus, changes anywhere in the system reverberate unpredictably and often dangerously. This increased turbulence and interconnectedness requires that chief administrators within universities and colleges think and plan more strategically.

Kotler and Murphy (1981) point out that for colleges and universities to survive in the troubled years ahead, a strong emphasis on planning is essential. The type of planning that appears to be most appropriate for the future is strategic planning. It is one of the most revolutionary commercial sector developments in the past two decades and promises to be a potent tool for use in nonprofit organizations (p. 470).

Strategic planning, according to Peters (1979), is a process that directs an

organization's attention to the future, thereby enabling the organization to adapt more readily to change. The major contribution of the planning process to good management is the rationality it imposes on an organization's efforts to anticipate its future. Creative organizations are able to examine the basic assumptions under which they operate and to adapt them to new situations (p. 25).

Strategic planning belongs to the dimension of organizational change: adaptation. Keller (1983) points out that strategic planning, as distinct from traditional planned change, is characterized as an open-systems approach to developing a synergistic match between institutional strengths and opportunities. A much greater emphasis on strong executive leadership, marketing approaches, and institutional positioning is advocated for strategic planning. Schendel and Hatten (1972) outlined the major difference between strategic planning and traditional planning as being that the former was adaptive planning and suited to coping with changes and the latter was inertial and implicitly assumed a future that would duplicate the past (p. 207).

Strategic planning, as a new management tool applied by many institutions of higher education in the 1980s, has received extensive reviews in higher education literature. Most of the writers advocate the utility of this open-system and adaptive approach to planning in higher education (Allen & Chaffee, 1981; Cope, 1981; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Baldridge & Okimi, 1982; Keller, 1983; Sibley, 1986; Steeples, 1988; Jones, 1990).

During 1984 and 1985, the University of Alberta launched its strategic planning movement to examine every aspect of the University and the University's mandate for teaching, research, and service to the public. Its strategic planning document, entitled *The Next Decade and Beyond*, endorsed a number of policies which would guide the future development of the University. Influenced by this strategic planning effort, the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta initiated its own strategic planning project in 1986.

The Context of the Study

The Faculty of Education is an embedded organization of the University of Alberta which, like many other organizations, is facing a turbulent environment and is being challenged to adapt to new and varied demands. Since 1911, the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta has emerged from a few discipline-based courses to an independent faculty responsible for teacher preparation, graduate research, and a wide range of community services. It has become the third largest faculty of the University of Alberta with an enrollment of approximately 3,500 students and 200 faculty members (Mishra, 1986, p. 49). Headed by the Dean, the Faculty had two Associate Deans: one for Research and External Relations and the other for Undergraduate Studies; two Assistant Deans: one for Field Experiences and the other for Student Services; six Department Chairs: the Department of Elementary Education, the Department of Secondary Education, the Department of Educational Psychology, the Department of Educational Foundations, the Department of Educational Administration, and the Department of Adult, Career, and Technology Education; and four supporting service units: Space and Equipment Planning, Instructional Technology, Educational Research, and Clinical Services. Five committees: the Faculty of Education Council (FEC), the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Education Council (FEC-EC), the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), the Committee on Course and Program Review and Approval (CCPRA) and the Faculty Salaries and Promotions Committee (FSPC) are often noted as the most influential of Faculty committees because of their central role in policy development and co-ordination. All these committees are chaired by the Dean, except the CCPRA, which is chaired by the Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies. With the exception of the DAC, these committees are collegial bodies bound by majority votes.

The Faculty of Education is involved in a number of organizational networks for financial, contractual, professional and academic reasons. The Government of Alberta,

through its two departments--the Department of Education and the Department of Advanced Education--and through its contractual relationship and financial support, has been the most important source of influence on the provision of teacher education. The Alberta Teachers' Association and the Alberta School Trustees' Association have representation on the Faculty of Education Council. The other institutions that influence the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta are the two Faculties of Education of the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge, and the Faculte Saint-Jean of the University of Alberta. Thus, the Faculty's relationship with other organizations and its representation on various committees allows it to draw information from the specific environments when the Faculty needs it.

In 1986, the Dean of the Faculty launched an ambitious and comprehensive planning effort to help shape its future. The scope of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project included (1) the mission of the Faculty, (2) the organization of the Faculty, (3) the services provided, (4) internal and external relationships, and (5) the policies and programs of concern to the Faculty as a whole which were not specific to any one department. This study attempted to examine the process of strategic planning in higher education through its application in the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate, describe, and explain the strategic planning process whereby the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta designed and implemented its Strategic Planning Project. The major question which directed this study was: On what basis did the leadership of the Faculty of Education decide to initiate a Strategic Planning Project and how was it carried out? The following subsidiary questions guided this study:

1. What were the major factors which influenced the Dean of the Faculty of Education to initiate the Strategic Planning Project?
2. What were the design and structure of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project?
3. How was the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project carried out?
 - a) What approaches and procedures were employed in the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
 - b) What outcomes resulted from the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
 - c) Who were involved in the process of the Strategic Planning Project and what was the nature of their involvement?

Significance of the Study

This study has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, there is a need to examine the utility of the concept of strategic planning in the higher education context. It is hoped that this study will make some contribution to the field of organization theory, will add to existing knowledge concerning the nature of organizational change, and will provide some direction for future research on strategic planning and strategic management, especially in a higher education setting.

Practically, the results of the study may be of some value to the chief executive administrators in the university faculty where they have a dual role to play. In the first place, they must be concerned with the outer world. This role includes the analysis of environmental conditions and the introduction of the kinds of planning that will transform the institution into a dynamic and adapting organization that is capable of responding to environmental needs. On the other hand, they have to maintain the stability and autonomy of the institution. They have to provide the best that is known about effective education, which requires influencing the environment to meet instructional needs. The central focus

of strategic planning is on developing a good fit between the organization's activities and the demands of the environment around it. The concept of strategic planning has the elements of awareness, responsiveness, proactive changes, planning and futurity which are relevant to academic institutions as well as to other organizations. Hopefully, the model emerging from the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project will be of some help to the senior administrators in Canadian universities in furthering their understanding of the concept of strategic planning and its application in higher education.

Definition of Terms

A number of terms that are used throughout this study are defined below in order to provide a common basis for understanding.

Planned change is defined as "a conscious and deliberate attempt to manage events so that the outcome is redirected by design to some predetermined end" (Hanson, 1979, p. 291).

Planning is defined as "a conscious process by which an institution assesses its current state and the likely future condition of its environment, identifies possible future states for itself, and then develops organizational strategies, policies, and procedures for selecting and getting to one or more of them." (Peterson, 1980, p. 114)

Strategic planning is defined as the process of developing and maintaining a strategic fit between the organization and its changing environments.

Mission is the basic purpose of an organization, that is, what it is trying to accomplish.

Goal is a major variable that the organization will emphasize.

Objective is an organizational goal that is made specific with respect to magnitude, time, and responsibility.

Opportunity is any favorable situation in the organization's environment, often a trend or change of some kind or an overlooked need, that supports the demand for a product or service and permits the institution to enhance its position.

Threat is any unfavorable situation in the organization's environment that is potentially damaging to the organization and its strategy. It may be a barrier, a constraint, or anything that might inflict problems, damages, or injury to the organization.

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations

Both the descriptive nature of this study and its purpose, to examine and understand the strategic planning process of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta, made it inevitable that the focus of the study should be on a single organization.

This study was delimited to the period from November, 1985 to November, 1989, during which the Faculty of Education initiated and implemented its strategic planning project.

This study was delimited to the analysis of documents to which the researcher could obtain access and to the collection of data from those individuals and groups deemed significant to this particular strategic planning process.

Limitations

Certain limitations were imposed on this study by the nature of the data sources available. These were related to the degree of access to relevant documentary materials and the respondents' willingness to be interviewed.

Another limitation was the numbers of people who could be interviewed in the available time. Further, as most of the data for this study were collected in interview situations from persons who often relied upon their memories in describing events,

accuracy in the individuals' recollections might not always have been achieved. Unique aspects of this Faculty might limit the ability to transfer the findings of this research.

Organization of Thesis

This chapter presents a background of the study which includes an overview and purpose of the study, the institutional setting, a statement of the main research problem, the significance of the study and its limitations, delimitations, and a definition of terms.

Chapter 2 contains a review of literature relevant to strategic planning, with special reference to the higher educational sector.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology of this study. Included is a discussion of the case study methodology, the process used for collecting and analyzing data, and the procedures used for ensuring trustworthiness.

Chapter 4 contains a description of the data relevant to the rationale for initiating the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, and its design and organizational structure.

Chapter 5 describes the procedures used in the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project and the outcomes resulted from the process.

Chapter 6 focuses upon discussions on the major themes and issues which emerged from the study of the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project in relation to the literature on strategic planning.

Chapter 7, the concluding chapter, contains a summary of the study and its findings, personal reflections, and finally, the implications for practice, and further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, a general review of the concept and process of strategic planning is presented. Because strategic planning began in the business sector, and much of the writing in higher education has been influenced by the experiences in business, strategic planning is discussed for the business as well as the higher education sectors. Descriptions of the major findings of some related research on strategic planning in the business and higher education sectors follow.

Strategic Planning in Business

The Rise of Strategic Planning

Formal strategic planning with its modern design characteristics was first introduced in business corporations in the mid-1950s. At the time, it was essentially the largest companies that developed formal strategic planning systems--they were called long-range planning systems. Since then formal strategic planning has matured until virtually all large companies around the world have some sort of system for strategic planning and an increasing number of small companies have been following their example. This experience has produced a vast and important body of knowledge about strategic planning (Steiner, 1979b, p. 7).

The key management task for any corporation is to run the business so it will survive and grow. Even under the most favorable conditions, this is a formidable task. From the late 1960s, management has faced an increasingly complex operating environment. Management's task has grown exponentially as managers have had to

acquire, process, and apply new knowledge related to technology shifts, changing dynamics of the marketplace, expectations and quality of human resources, environment values, increased government intervention, and the explosion of information. As business became more international in scope, these complexities assumed a multidimensional character. Thus, the complexity of these tasks and lack of skills in many new and diverse areas made it necessary for management to acquire specialized expertise to supplement existing skills. Major emphasis was placed on acquiring skills in the business strategy area. This area was generally perceived to be the key to sifting through the complex environment of a corporation and its market and thus producing a coherent and comprehensive strategic plan to achieve a corporation's objectives.

Strategic planning systems evolve in response to changing environmental conditions and managerial problems. Formal strategic planning, and business-level planning in particular, is simply the latest in a continuing series of advances in practice. This progression can be segmented into three sequential phases, which are summarized as (a) budget-based planning, (b) long-range planning, and (c) strategic planning (Day, 1984, p. 7).

Strategic planning has played an essential and important role in business management during the past several decades. The following section presents a generic model of strategic planning.

The Normative Model of Strategic Planning

The primary tasks of strategic planning are to understand the environment, define organizational goals, identify options, make and implement decisions, and evaluate actual performance. Thus, strategic planning aims to exploit the new and different opportunities of tomorrow, in contrast to long-range planning, which tries to optimize for tomorrow the trends of today (Drucker, 1980, p. 61).

In recent years a number of normative guidelines and procedures for strategic planning have been presented. Most recently, these have been proposed by Belohlav and Waggener (1980), Bourgeois (1980), Glueck (1980), Godiwalla (1980), Leontiades (1982), and Quinn (1980). Such models have emerged primarily through a synthesis of case studies and organization theory research (Mintzberg, 1977). Normative or prescriptive models of strategic planning generally reflect an explicit, planned and rational approach (Wheelen and Hunger, 1984).

The resulting general model is typically viewed as a continuous process involving some eight steps or phases as follows:

First, establishing mission. The mission determines the organization's overall direction and purpose (Godiwalla, 1980; Henry, 1980; Quinn, 1980).

Second, setting objectives. A logical extension of mission is the setting of objectives in order to provide targets and establish performance criteria for evaluating alternative courses of action (Bourgeois, 1980).

Third, external environment analysis or environmental scanning. Once objectives have been set, resource availability, both inside and outside the corporation, must be determined along with an identification of potential impediments to the achievement of objectives (Grant and King, 1979). Resource availability and possible actions of competitors must then be evaluated in order to identify opportunities and threats (Belohlav & Waggener, 1980; Diffenbach, 1983).

Fourth, internal environmental analysis. The corporation identifies its strengths and weaknesses (Naylor, 1979; Lindsay and Rue, 1980; Quinn, 1980). The identification of internal strengths and weaknesses takes the form of a careful managerial audit of major intraorganizational systems such as marketing, production, and financial management.

Fifth, the development of strategic alternatives (Grinyer & Norburn, 1974). From this set of alternative strategies, corporate strategists select what they perceive to be the best or optimal strategy.

Sixth, selecting a strategy. In this step, the characteristics of future events are considered. Among the items that must be analyzed are market position, sales, and capital structure (Fomburn & Astley, 1983).

Seventh, implementing a strategy. The focus of implementation is the allocation of resources to organizational units that will carry out the various stages of the strategy.

The final step in the process is controlling to insure the strategy is achieved. Evaluation of the performance of the strategy in relation to expectations must be made and corrective actions must be taken (Ansoff, 1977).

Such a model stresses a corporation's mission and objectives setting, external and internal environmental analysis, and strategy development, implementation, control and evaluation. However, the strategic planning process can also be defined as the set of human interactions, formal and informal, that take place in the course of generating a strategic plan (Lyles & Lenz, 1982). The strategic planning process serves both an instrumental and symbolic function. The following sections outline how instrumental and symbolic characteristics systematically influence aspects of the strategic issues to which decision makers attend. The focus is first on the instrumental characteristics of the strategic planning process and the symbolic characteristics follow.

The Instrumental Characteristics

At the instrumental level, the strategic planning process serves as a type of performance program--absorbing uncertainty by reducing the information load facing decision makers (Boulton et al., 1982). Through the planning process, information critical to the organization's survival is received (Lyles and Lenz, 1982) and interpreted (Daft & Wetck, 1984). Formally or informally, this process produces the array of strategic issues that have been earmarked as significant for the organization's future.

Organizations employ a variety of strategic planning processes. Four distinctive characteristics of the strategic planning process are presented in terms of their implications for the content of strategic issues considered as relevant and important for the organization.

Focus. Planning focus refers to the division of labor between corporate- and division-level management in initiating, formulating, reviewing, and executing plans (Lorange, 1979). Organizations can be characterized as having either a bottom-up or top-down planning focus. If the focus is bottom-up, division-level management plays the primary role in the planning process and the process can be characterized as more participative. In contrast, where the process is top-down, corporate-level management secures the major role in the planning process and participation in the process is more limited.

Formality. Organizations also vary in the extent to which there are written procedures, schedules, and documents guiding the planning process (Bazziz and Grinyer, 1981). While the planning focus had its major effect on the scope and variety of the issues considered, formality makes its mark on the number of issues in the issue array and the frequency of issue turnover. It is posited that use of a more formalized planning process increases the number of strategic issues being given consideration at any point in time, but decreases the frequency of issue turnover (Dutton, 1987).

Diversity. Involvement in the planning process can vary in terms of the variety of individuals involved at any particular level in the organization. While the top-down vs. bottom-up distinction highlighted the possibility of different approaches to vertical involvement, planning diversity captures the variety in horizontal involvement. Where planning diversity is high there are many different types of individuals involved in the planning process, and multiple and potentially clashing perspectives have input into the identification of strategic issues. As a result it is expected that a greater number of issues are attended to, they are of greater variety and the issues tend to be broader in scope (Dutton & Duncan, 1987, p. 107).

Intensity. Finally, organizational planning processes vary in terms of the frequency of contact of planning participants. In some organizations the planning cycle requires frequent, lengthy, face-to-face contacts between planning participants. In other organizations participants communicate once a year, and when they do it is through written rather than verbal contact. Planning intensity captures the level of personal resources participants must devote to the planning process. It is assumed that intensity is highest when participants meet frequently, in person, over long periods of time. It is proposed that the intensity of the planning process expands the scope of the issues considered, decreases the size of the issue array, and increases the frequency of the issue turnover (Dutton & Duncan, 1987, p. 107).

The Symbolic Characteristics

Symbolically, the strategic planning process serves to build consensus in the organization by providing short-hand expressions (Bresser & Bishop, 1983) or simplifying categories (Starbuck, 1983) for communication and understanding. The process has ritualistic elements, formal procedures and communication programs that reinforce a sense of pervasive rationality and control in the organization (Ackoff, 1981).

According to Peters (1987, pp. 510-11), the symbolic characteristics of the strategic planning process are (a) getting everyone involved, (b) not constrained by overall corporate "assumptions" (e.g., about the general economic picture), (c) perpetually fresh, forcing the asking of new questions, (d) not to be left to planners, and (e) requiring lots of "noodling time" and vigorous debate. The strategic plan, whose development involves everyone, therefore, should be shared with everyone after completion.

Strategic planning is a process that gives attention to (a) designing, (b) implementing, and (c) monitoring plans for improving decision making. Like many other processes in organizations, strategic planning often results in a product--a specific written document that enables all personnel to comprehend, analyze, and critique the goals,

objectives, and strategies that are being used to achieve the organization's mission. It is this ongoing analysis, critique, and revision of plans that provides for the dynamic personal interaction characteristic of strategic planning (Allen, 1982; Bradford and Cohen, 1984; Cleveland, 1985).

Strategic planning provides organizational direction through the development of a realistic mission with clearly defined goals and objectives. Moreover, strategic planning focuses on the future and the interaction of the organization with its ever-changing environment (Peterson, 1980). Through such planning, an organization can shed its "status-quo" mentality and exercise creativity in the art of planning, management, and decision making (Cope, 1981). An atmosphere of innovation is fostered within the context of strategic planning because participants begin to recognize the opportunities and threats that exist in the environment (Kotler & Murphy, 1981). In addition, strategic planning enables the organization to capitalize on its internal strengths through the development of plans with varying time perspectives. Strategic planning also forces people to face reality and to establish priorities (Lewis, 1983).

So far, the major characteristics of successful strategic planning have been reviewed. However, the success of strategic planning also depends on the ability of the corporation to effectively manage the issues. The following section presents the major issues of strategic planning in business.

Key Issues in Strategic Planning

A major problem in strategic planning lies in both analyzing a chaotic environment and developing a level of understanding that utilizes intuitive skills to create strategic opportunities. McGinnis (1984) identifies six issues that affect the ability of a corporation to understand its environment and thus create strategic opportunities.

Intelligence. Intelligence is the corporation's ability to simultaneously scan and interpret its external environments, monitor itself, and communicate effectively with itself. A weak link in any of these three areas undermines the total corporate intelligence system.

Balance. Balance is the ability to be centralized and decentralized simultaneously. Direction and policy making should be centralized, while operating authority should be decentralized.

Analysis. Analysis is the ability to evaluate systematically a problem using both quantitative and qualitative information and to develop an array of possible responses. The role of analysis is the clear delineation of choices and the determination of strategy.

Innovation. Innovation occurs when a corporation either learns to do something it did not do before, and then proceeds to do it in a sustained way or learns not to do something that it formerly did, and proceeds not to do it in a sustained way.

Proactivity. Proactivity is defined as the corporation shaping its environment with new products, technologies, and administrative techniques.

Risk Taking. Risk taking refers to the ability to take bold and venturesome action in the face of uncertainty. Another problem with risk taking is that many managers associate risk with change. In some instances, however, a lack of change may be more dangerous than a bold and risky strategy.

The three issues of intelligence, organizational balance, and analysis are primarily analytical, rational, systematically-oriented activities. On the other hand, the three issues of innovation, proactivity, and risk taking are primarily holistic, intuitive-oriented activities. McGinnis (1984) suggests the success of strategic planning depends on the ability of the corporation to integrate analysis and intuition, and effective integration depends on the ability to manage effectively the issues of intelligence, balance, analysis, innovation, proactivity, and risk taking.

Research on Strategic Planning in Business

This section reviews the studies related to the role, status, and importance of strategic planning in business and industry.

Ang and Chua (1979) conducted research to provide insight into the current application of strategic and corporate planning processes in United States corporations. The issues addressed were the extent of strategic planning, the organizational structure of the planning function, the pervading attitudes toward strategic planning, the planning process in terms of content and revision frequency, and the perceived benefits and problems associated with strategic planning. Questionnaires were sent to 500 large United States corporations as listed in *Fortune* magazine. Twenty-three percent of the corporations returned the questionnaires.

The findings showed that 94 percent of the firms had some form of documented strategic plan. Planning involved widespread participation throughout the whole company as indicated by the positions of the persons responding to the questionnaire. Of the companies that did not have strategic planning, two-thirds indicated they would eventually be involved in strategic planning and 55 percent had centralized planning functions with a separate planning staff (Ang & Chua, 1979, pp. 99-102).

Cost savings were not considered as an important benefit by companies employing a planning model. The greatest benefits were the ability to explore more alternatives, more efficient planning, better quality and faster decision making. Ninety-five percent of those responding indicated some problems with the planning process. Some of the problems included obtaining useful data input and credibility of output. Other difficulties associated with the implementation of the planning process as reported by Ang and Chua (1979) related to organizational politics.

This study has shown that while strategic planning has become an integral part of the decision process in some corporations, companies need to develop an understanding of the role of strategic planning and the necessity of a suitable environment to support strategic

planning. Also, corporations should realize that strategic planning is a dynamic process. That is, strategic plans must not be thought of as extrapolations of short-run plans.

Wood (1980) sought to determine and evaluate the state of development of strategic planning in banks, an industry frequently referred to in the literature. Also investigated were the trends and the nature of the planning procedures which had been adopted.

In 1976, and again in 1978, a questionnaire was sent to officers in the 150 largest domestic banks in the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia in the United States (Wood, 1980). From the two mailings, officers in a total of 97 banks returned the questionnaire. The survey findings indicated that by 1978, eight-two percent of the banks were involved in strategic planning. Of this group, fifty-four percent started their systems between 1974 and 1977. By mid-1978, only six percent of the banks had not completed their initial year with strategic planning.

Wood (1980) found that actual plans were usually prepared by the line managers after they had been provided with necessary objectives and assumptions by top management. Although 89 percent of the banks indicated top management fully supported strategic planning efforts, the problems mentioned could be traced back to inadequacies on the part of top management (pp. 91-97).

The study emphasized the fact that the support of top management was important for the success of strategic planning efforts. Evidence from talking with bank officers indicated that strategic planning systems would either never get going or quickly fall apart if top management wavered in its support (Wood, 1980).

These two studies related to planning in business and industry support the belief that management recognizes the importance and critical role of strategic planning. Furthermore, the studies suggest that the "better" companies, the more successful ones, or the more profitable ones place a greater emphasis upon planning over a two- to five-year time horizon. The studies also identify a number of impediments to planning which exist, however, as one might anticipate.

Summary

Strategic planning was first introduced in business and industry in the 1950s and has evolved during the past decades in response to changing environmental conditions and managerial problems. The major tasks of strategic planning are to understand the environment, define organizational goals, identify options, make and implement decisions, and evaluate actual performance.

The similarities that emerge from a review of the literature suggest an eight-step normative model of the strategic planning process in business. The strategic planning process serves both instrumental and symbolic functions. Instrumental characteristics and symbolic characteristics of the strategic planning process were outlined.

Issues that affect the ability of a corporation to understand its environment and thus create strategic opportunities were identified. Furthermore, the success of strategic planning depends on the ability to effectively integrate these issues. The importance of this leadership function was also evident in the research.

Studies related to strategic planning in business and industry show the critical and important role of strategic planning. Business corporations realize that strategic planning is a dynamic process. Full commitment of the executive leadership to strategic planning and to developing an understanding of strategic planning so as to create a supportive environment were greatly emphasized.

Strategic Planning in Higher Education

This section describes the application of strategic planning in higher education and reviews a number of similarities and differences between strategic planning models applied in business and higher education sectors as reported in the related literature.

The Application of Strategic Planning in Higher Education

The key to more effective leadership in the management of institutions of higher education is the wise application of improved principles of planning. Through planning, institutions can better understand the future toward which they are moving and can anticipate the nature and level of resources that will be necessary if their goals are to be achieved (Lee and Van Horn, 1983, pp. 7-8).

Planning, according to Albanese (1975), is "the process or activity of defining in advance specifically what needs to be done in order to achieve particular goals, how it should be done, when and where it should be done, and who should do it" (p. 166). Peterson (1980) defines planning as "a conscious process by which an institution assesses its current state and the likely future condition of its environment, identifies possible future states for itself, and then develops organizational strategies, policies, and procedures for selecting and getting to one or more of them" (p. 114). Such planning is not new to higher education. Lee and Van Horn (1983) reviewed the planning efforts of colleges and universities since the end of World War II. They reported how planning had been used during 1970-1980 to come to grips with slower growth, financial stringency, and growing uncertainty; and they defined the planning needs of the 1980s and the dynamic character that planning required if it was to meet these and other challenges (pp. 20-36).

Glenny (1976) pointed out that master plans flourished in higher education during the 1950s. By the end of the 1960s almost every institution, system, and state government had some instrument or series of instruments that could be called a "master plan". At that time, these master plans were drawn up to deal with rising enrollments and to ensure some orderliness in the expansion and growth of new programs and new campuses. As education moved from the growth and expansion age of the 1960s to the increasingly troubled 1970s, these master plans often failed to deal with the multiple complexities of the changing environment.

Baldrige and Deal (1983) identified the problems in traditional long-range planning: (a) planning processes are complicated and time-consuming; (b) there is a gap between planners at the top administrative level and the planners on the operational level; (c) frequent turnover of the executive disrupts the planning process; (d) budgets are poorly linked to plans; and (e) there is a mismatch with administrative behavior (pp. 169-172). Therefore, systematic and ongoing planning is expected to be a critical imperative for colleges and universities in the remainder of this century. An organization dependent on faculty members who are highly individualistic and who cannot be managed by issuing orders must still find a way to give focus and unity to their activity (Keller, 1983). Allison (1974) and Baldrige (1977, 1978) borrowed an alternative model of planning that more realistically matches actual administrative behavior in higher education: that of strategic planning.

Strategic planning should not be confused with any of the planning levels currently used in higher education. Kotler and Murphy (1981) define strategic planning as the process of developing and maintaining a strategic fit between the organization and its changing marketing opportunities (p. 471). Baldrige and Deal (1983) point out that the central focus of strategic planning is developing a good fit between the organization's activities and the demands of the environment around it. Strategic planning looks at the big picture--the long-range destiny of the institution, the competition between this organization and others in the environment, the market for organizational products and services, and the mix of internal resources to accomplish the organization's purpose. Strategic planning emphasizes flexibility and quick response to changes in the outside environment. Its basic perspective is external--looking at the environment around the organization--rather than internal--looking at the organization's structure. Effectiveness is the goal of strategic planning (p. 173).

Differences between Traditional Planning and Strategic Planning

Kotler and Murphy (1981, pp. 479-89) and Baldrige and Deal (1983, pp. 175-77) draw out the distinctions between traditional long-range planning and the emerging theory of strategic planning: (a) Strategic planning focuses on the organization's destiny; (b) Strategic planning is usually the task of top echelon managers; (c) Time orientations in strategic planning are short range or medium range; (d) Strategic planning is extremely sensitive to the environment around the organization; (e) Strategic planning is fundamentally an art rather than a science; (f) A stream of decisions in the strategic process help move the organization into the future. Cope (1987, p. 4) identified the major differences as:

<u>Strategic Planning</u>	<u>Traditional Planning</u>
Emphasis on the environment	Emphasis on the enterprise
Oriented toward change	Emphasis on stability
Vision directed	Follows a blue print
Inductive and integrated	Deductive and analytical
Proactive	Reactive
Emphasis on doing the right things	Emphasis on doing things right
Art	Science
Open and external focus	Closed and internal focus
Anticipates changes	Extrapolates from the past
Current decisions based on looking from the future	Current decisions based on looking from the present
Entrepreneurial and action oriented, even when there is ambiguity	Inaction when there is ambiguity
Emphasis on innovation and creativity	Emphasis on the tried and tested
Synergistic	Univariate
Enterprise's environment and context are primary determinants of strategy/choices/direction	Enterprise's strengths and weaknesses are primary determinants of strategy/choices/direction
Emphasis on opinions, intuition and the qualitative	Emphasis on facts and the quantitative
Orientation toward effectiveness	Orientation toward efficiency
Patterns are in a stream of decisions	Decisions are made and carried out

The above distinctions suggest that application of the strategic planning concept is focused on the external environment, oriented toward institutional changes, and directed by a vision of future states. It is oriented toward finding synergy, wholeness, effectiveness,

and patterns in decision making as people within the institution use qualitative information to inform their intuitive judgments.

Like many other concepts and practices, strategic planning, having shown its usefulness in business, was borrowed by higher education. Why did higher education need to borrow strategic planning from the business literature? Did strategic planning fit the institutions of higher education? The following section provides the answers.

Need for Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Chaffee (1985a) points out that many authors advocate the ways that strategic planning can provide the kinds of thinking and action that higher education institutions desperately need to survive the lean years of the 1980s and 1990s. First, strategic planning encourages awareness of the organization's environment. Higher education organizations have exhibited an isolationist attitude for so long that they are in real danger of losing their constituencies and, therefore, their resources. Second, strategic planning encourages decision makers to recognize the fact that they need to anticipate or counter the moves of their competitors if they hope to attract students and funders. During the past 15 years, higher education has indeed stepped into a highly competitive marketplace, although many administrators would not admit it until quite recently. Finally, strategic planning encourages an approach that could be called "anticipatory adaptation." By scanning the environment, an organization can evaluate future possibilities and make changes to better equip itself for both the present and future marketplace (p. 135).

Sibley (1986) summarizes five main themes on the need for strategic planning in higher education. First, colleges and universities are now facing the need to compete. Higher education faces scarcity, declining enrollment, and financial crises. The institutions need a strategy to ensure that their organizations will make it through the next decade. Second, if the institutions are to emulate the successful strategy, they will certainly have to "scan the environment." Strategic planning is an attempt to give organizations antennae to

sense the changing environment. Third, the institutions must assess themselves, in a far more rigorous manner than they have done previously. Fourth, academic quality will be a major concern in the next decade or two. Quality throughout a college's operation is therefore a condition of survival and a must for academic management. Finally, forms of university governance and management stand in need of radical reform. Institutions that wish to flourish or even survive can no longer be content to remain "organized anarchies," practising what Cohen and March (1974) term the "garbage can model" of decision-making. What is required is a more active, change-oriented management style (pp. 81-102).

Some authors imply that strategic planning has value for higher education institutions because it has value for business and higher education institutions are or will become similar to business (Doyle & Lynch, 1976; Schendel & Hatten, 1972). Other authors list similarities between businesses and universities, such as concern with the external environment; internal effects of demographic change; and some degree of external control from government, politics, consumers, unionism, and tenure (Wood & Wood, 1981).

It is not surprising that some authors (Newman and Wallender, 1978; Thomas, 1978; Thomas, 1980; Blyn & Zoerner, 1982; Cyert, 1988) take the opposite point of view. They put forth a number of the distinctions, without conclusive evidence, for higher education organizations. Higher education organizations, they say, have multiple, often conflicting goals because many important higher education outcomes are intangible and leadership charisma tends to be important because there are fewer measures of effectiveness in education than in business. Chief executives in higher education organizations lack power. Employees in higher educational institutions are more committed to their profession than to the institution. Resource providers for the institutions tend to intrude into institutional functioning. There are restraints on the reward and punishment options. Open debate, broad participation, and approval from representative bodies are expected in

higher educational institutions. Strategic options are constrained in higher education. The influence of clients (students) on some higher education institutions is weak. Higher education lacks the opportunity to achieve economies of scale. Geographic location is a significant determinant of success. Functions tend to be integrated, not separable.

In some contexts, these points are taken as intrinsic characteristics of higher education that invalidate the use of business-derived management practices; in others, they are construed as flaws that could be remedied by using business management practices. In other words, even if one admits that these are true and unique traits, this in itself does not determine the suitability of applying business techniques to higher education institutions. However, the range of strategic planning options is narrower in higher education than in business if the list of differences between the two is accepted. Many writers have offered suggestions based on their own logic or experience as to how strategic planning may be modified to suit higher education settings. The following section presents a general model of strategic planning applied by higher education.

Model of Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Strategic planning is new to most higher educational institutions. Kotler and Fox (1985) define strategic planning in higher education as follows:

Strategic planning is the process of developing and maintaining a strategic fit between the institution's goals and capabilities and its marketing opportunities. It relies on developing a clear institutional mission, supporting goals and objectives, a sound strategy, and appropriate implementation. (p.73)

There is a commonality to the processes used for developing the strategic planning model in higher education as outlined in the literature (Cope, 1978; Hollowood, 1979; Mayhew, 1979; Peterson, 1980; Cope, 1981; Keller, 1983; Uhl, 1983; Morrison, Renfro, & Boucher, 1984; Kotler & Fox, 1985). The model has six components:

In the first step, environmental analysis, the institution must analyze its present and future environment. The external environment assessment seeks to uncover the

opportunities and threats that have confronted, are confronting, and will confront the institution.

Resource analysis, the second step, includes a review of its major resources to suggest what it can accomplish. The internal environment assessment is actually a self-assessment of the internal operations of the institution and an objectively drawn self-portrait of the institution's strengths and weaknesses.

In the third step, goal formulation, the institution establishes its overall goals, develops its mission statement and its specific objectives.

Strategy formulation is the fourth step. Here, the institution selects the most cost-effective strategy for reaching these goals and objectives.

This is followed by the fifth step, organization design. The institution must have the appropriate structure, people, and culture in order to successfully implement each strategy.

And finally, in the systems design stage, implementing the strategy usually requires changes in the institution's system of information, planning, and control.

The success of the implementation of strategic planning depends on the institution's ability to identify and manage issues. The next section deals with the identification and management of issues in implementing strategic planning.

Issue Management in Strategic Planning

Chan (1986) identifies six key issues in the implementation of strategic planning in higher educational institutions. The key issues are: organizational balance, institutional culture, involvement of line managers, action imperatives, linkage of planning and budgeting, and incremental improvement.

Organization Balance. A balance between a centralized and decentralized decision process is emphasized by McGinnis (1984). Strategic planning is commonly considered the primary function of chief executive officers. This top-down orientation implies that

essential decisions about an institution's future can be made by a few top-level administrators with the support of a central planning staff. Goal setting at this level tends to ignore detailed and laborious implementation steps. "Strategic leaps" are often valued, regardless of the institution's capacity and its ability to mobilize a significant amount of resources in a relatively short period of time (Hayes, 1986).

This emphasis on centralized decision making goes against the collegiate organizational arrangement. In most universities and colleges, participative decision making among professionals is the norm. A top-down approach tends to alienate faculty and academic units. While entrepreneurship and responsiveness in formulating academic strategies are essential in enabling an institution to maintain its competitiveness and viability, ingenuity and innovations must come directly from members and areas in which the actions will be carried out.

The focus of centralized decision making is best devoted to the articulation of the institutional mission, a unified vision for the future, and the overall internal planning assumptions. Action plans and strategies should be generated through a decentralized process to instill a sense of ownership and commitment to the ideas.

Institutional Culture. A second challenge is to build strategic planning on an institutional culture. Culture can be viewed in terms of decision style, communication patterns, and governance models. Goal ambiguity, contested goals, service orientation, high professionalism, and fragmented professional staffs are only a partial list of organizational characteristics exhibited in most universities and colleges. Competing governance styles, ranging from bureaucratic, collegial, and political, to organized anarchy, may be present simultaneously in one organization. Decision making styles also vary, often from faculty to faculty, or from one vice president to another. These characteristics make institutional commitment to a common set of goals and objectives difficult.

Participative management, particularly in the form of the institution-wide committee, is the likely norm and also considered a "good" approach. However, the risk-

taking nature, flexibility, timeliness, and responsiveness demanded in successful strategic planning can rarely be accomplished in a committee setting. Effective faculty participation in planning and decision making must be redefined and more collaborative solutions developed, as suggested by Floyd (1985).

Action Imperatives. Effective strategic planning must move beyond vaguely formulated goals. Without a detailed action plan, implementation can go awry, fall apart, or be executed in a different direction. The same goal statement can be implemented in numerous ways and be drastically different, depending on the interpretation and motivation of line managers.

The implied rationality in strategic planning assumes that environmental forces can be regularly and systematically monitored. Strategies can then be formulated, trade-offs of alternatives can be evaluated, and actions follow. This analytical approach operates well in a static environment, but in reality, decisions are made continuously and rarely follow a rational model. Therefore, when the focus of strategic planning is not at the action level, the trade-off analysis tends to offer little incentive, and the overflow of information can block the decision maker's ability to choose among alternatives (Ewell & Chaffee, 1981). Intuition and judgement must be exercised in combination with analysis to move the planning from goals and objectives into actions (McGinnis, 1984).

Involvement of Line Managers. To move the locus of strategic planning from the decision level to the action level requires input from academic and administrative managers who have direct responsibilities in implementation. Inadequate participation by these managers often results in resistance or withdrawal of support. The increasing professionalism and specialization in higher education management have shifted more problem solving responsibilities to the operational level. Planners should take both autonomy and expertise into consideration at this level in implementation.

Preparing managers to think strategically, to monitor external trends regularly, and to develop action plans in support of university goals would help build institutional strength

in the long run. Preparation means better communication of the university's goals and general direction and increased awareness and commitment on the manager's part about institutional mission and purposes. Planning should be required as an integral component of each academic and administrative manager's responsibility. The uneven presence of expertise and readiness within an institution usually delays the implementation timetable.

Incremental Improvement. Strategic planning, like many innovations in higher education, is either considered deceptively simple, or its usefulness is overestimated (Allen & Chaffee, 1981). In the pursuit of national prestige and excellence, many universities and colleges tend to set goals too high, regardless of their institutional mission and capabilities. However, only a few institutions are resource rich and can quickly redirect their futures. Unfortunately for the rest of these institutions, without a dramatic growth in the endowment fund, strategic leaps imply a significant shift of existing resources from one area to another, and may result in some undesirable sacrifices.

The rational model inherent in strategic planning also encourages the planner to aim high in goals and objectives, and then identifies strategies and resources. McGinnis (1984) suggests that a reversed logic is productive: an institution should first assess its capabilities --financial, human, program, service, and physical resources--then develop opportunities when appropriate. This argues that more attention should be devoted to enhancing institutional readiness in its human resources and financial resources. Steady incremental improvements are building blocks of a healthier institution.

Linkage of Planning and Budgeting. Strategic planning can quickly falter and become an annual ritual if it is not closely integrated with the annual budget process. In most cases, implementation of new strategies requires additional human and financial resources. If not reviewed as part of an annual budget request, no priorities can be set. While the budget process offers direct incentives for all members participating in the deliberation, there may be a tendency to let the budget determine planning priorities. This confirms the need to emphasize actions in strategic planning. It may be difficult to map out

all the actions and the resource requirements for more than two to three years. Regular review of financial trends and ratios, and financial forecasts should be regarded as an essential analytical tool to link planning and budgeting as one process (Dickmeyer & Hughes, 1980).

The concept of issues management is gaining increased attention from both researchers and practitioners in the field of strategic planning. Lozier and Chittipeddi (1986, p. 4) define issues management as an ongoing organizational process concerned with the identification of issues that may impact on the strategic directions of the organization, the analysis of these issues to establish their relevance to the organization and the likelihood of their occurrence, and the development of appropriate organizational responses to these issues. Furthermore, the issues management process is one component of the strategic planning process. This definition implies that there are several stages in the issues management process: scanning the external environment to identify strategic issues; analyzing these issues for their likely impact and probability of occurrence; and developing suitable responses for managing the issues.

The usefulness of the issues management process stems from its potential to act as an early detector of significant external trends, and to provide the mechanisms for developing effective strategies to respond to those trends. According to Dutton, et al. (1983), issues management, or what they labeled as "strategic issue diagnosis" (SID), "affects both the process and content of subsequent phases of strategic decision making" (p. 308). The issues management process must therefore be linked to the more comprehensive strategic planning process in order to be effective.

Research on Strategic Planning in Higher Education

Baldrige and Deal (1983, pp. 177-181) provided us with an example of strategic planning at work in Mercy College in the Northeastern United States. Their evidence suggested that small private liberal arts colleges would be the institutions most threatened

by enrollment difficulties, and the Northeast United States would be the most vulnerable geographic area. Yet in spite of these dire forecasts, Mercy College contradicted the predictions, expanding its enrollment and programs from 1,500 students in 1972 to over 9,500 students in 1981 through strategic planning. The major efforts made by Mercy College were as follows: (a) shifting institutional mission in order to adapt to the external and internal pressures; (b) making a strategic decision: "Take the campus to the students"; (c) monitoring the environment and making the College respond to trends, changes, and needs; and (d) maintaining flexibility and applying contingent and strategic thinking to academic programs.

By examining this model, Baldridge and Deal (1983, p. 181) make four important points about the processes of implementing strategic planning at Mercy College:

(a) environmental monitoring is the key administrative action, for it can help match the institutional services with the market's demands; (b) administrative leadership is the key factor in this institution's growth and development; (c) an organizational climate encourages flexibility and leads to a contingency-strategic way of thinking; and (d) problem areas need to be continually monitored, for example, quality and quantity must be maintained in order to remain viable and effective.

Tack and Heberlein (1986, pp. 3-13) studied the strategic planning for graduate education of Bowling Green State University in the United States. Six basic principles in the implementation of strategic planning for graduate education were recommended.

First, the strategic planning framework must be developed in sufficient time for the contents to be utilized by departmental personnel in planning for the subsequent academic year. In addition, all participants in the process should understand that it will take three or four years to implement the recommendations included in the planning document. The development of the planning framework will take at least one year, and implementation will ultimately depend on the availability of funding as well as on the commitment of the participants in the planning process.

Second, planning for graduate education must be inextricably linked with other managerial processes within the institution.

Third, the framework that is developed must be realistic and capable of being implemented.

Fourth, it is important to recognize the paranoia of some faculty regarding the concept of selective excellence and its effects on their programs.

Fifth, the framework must be "sold" within the political context of the institution. All institutional participants must recognize the possibility that their programs can benefit from the enhancement of graduate education on institutional basis, and finally, the administrative officials must be committed to the process of enhancing graduate education. These individuals must demonstrate both their philosophical support and their financial commitment to the process.

Chan (1988, pp. 19-30) conducted research on faculty participation in strategic planning at DePaul University in the United States. As she pointed out, the successful implementation of strategic planning required institution-wide support, particularly from faculty members, who carry out the teaching, research, and service functions on a daily basis. The university pursued four strategies to increase faculty involvement and direct participation in the planning process: It (a) actively involved faculty in the clarification of the university's mission; (b) strengthened the faculty governance body; (c) enhanced faculty vitality through responsive resource allocation and infrastructure; and (d) employed multiple means of communication and consultation.

These four strategies have led to different types and levels of faculty participation in DePaul's strategic planning: some strategies encouraged direct and active participation of faculty representatives; others broadened the base of faculty involvement. The selection of an appropriate strategy should correspond to the planning stages. Some strategies are crucial at the initial phase; others should only be employed at the implementation phase. Each strategy presents different incentives for different groups of faculty (Chan, 1988).

DePaul's experience has confirmed that faculty members will seek to participate in strategic planning when the planning agenda has a direct bearing on the incentive system. But planners should broaden participation in order to create a climate for change and open dialogue. It is important to involve the faculty in the articulation of an institutional mission statement in order to build a common understanding of institutional purposes. Increasing opportunities for participation through the faculty council not only strengthen the academic governance but also preserve the collegial culture. The commitment of resources to improve faculty life and teaching and research conditions can generate faculty support. Communication and consultation should be conducted in formal and informal settings and at both the university and departmental levels. Multiple approaches, compatible with subcultures existing within the academic workplace, are essential for increasing faculty participation in strategic planning.

Chaffee (1984, pp. 212-41) studied two models of successful strategic planning in fourteen small private colleges in the United States. The model of strategic planning founded on the "adaptive" model, involves attuning the organization to changes in market demands and reorienting the organization as needed in order to maintain or increase the flow of resources from the market to the organization. On the basis of this model, colleges and universities have been advised to conduct market research, monitor trends in their environment, increase their flexibility, and update their program offerings (Heist & Warren, 1975; Lucas, 1979; Heger, 1982; Deutsch, 1983; & Redinbaugh & Redinbaugh, 1983).

The other model of strategic planning which is called the "interpretive" model, arises from the premise that an organization is a network of self-interested participants. According to the interpretive model, successful strategic planning requires skillful use of all forms of communication and of the symbols used to portray the collective reality of participants--in short, the management of meaning (Weick & Daft, 1983).

The fourteen colleges were selected from the northeast, central, Atlantic, and far west sections of the United States. The primary source of data was interviews with from six to fourteen individuals at each college who were chosen for their familiarity with strategies used during the 1970s and for the expected diversity in their points of view. A standard interview protocol for respondents dealt with the strategies used by the college to recover from decline, causes of decline, significant coincidental events, and the current conditions of the college. Data were also collected from documental research and the Higher Education General Information Survey, especially the annual financial and enrollment data on each college from 1972 through 1981.

The results show that of fourteen colleges attempting to recover from serious financial decline, half of them were more resilient than the other half. The adaptive model of strategic planning, based on the need for the college to be responsive to the individuals and groups who supply its most critical resources, was followed by most members of both sets of colleges. The adaptive model appeared to assist the colleges in their recovery efforts, but it did not account for the faster recovery of the more resilient set. The interpretive model of strategic planning, based on the theory that the organization is a network of participants who construct reality from their perceptions of the system, was followed consistently by the more resilient colleges to a greater extent than by the less resilient colleges. The interpretive model seems to have facilitated rapid recovery.

Chaffee (1984) concludes that turnaround management in private colleges is most effective when participants think of the organization simultaneously as an organism and as a social contract. Based on this perception, strategic planning combines aspects of the adaptive and interpretive models, attending both to the organization's exchanges with its market and to the participants' sense of meaning and satisfaction that is derived from their association with the organization. If the two approaches to strategy suggest conflicting courses of action, the clarity of results regarding the interpretive strategy implies that the interpretive strategy should take precedence.

The utility of the interpretive model of strategic planning in fostering rapid recovery suggests a number of observations for improving turnaround management. First, establishing an interpretive strategy that guides the adaptive strategy is preferable to using an adaptive strategy alone. Second, establishment of an interpretive strategy requires a strong and clear sense of organizational identity as well as a willingness to make decisions on the basis of that identity. Third, top administrators who base their actions on symbolic as well as substantive concerns will be more effective turnaround leaders than those who are not conscious of symbolic implications. Fourth, colleges have a wide range of strategic moves they might make productively. Finally, specific components of effective turnaround strategy evolve from and are unique to the institution (Chaffee, 1984).

Summary

In higher education in the 1980s, traditional planning models are not likely to be as helpful as proponents suggest. There are many flaws in the conventional long-range planning perspective.

By contrast, the literature on strategic planning offers a new set of emphases. The role of strategic planning is essential for higher education institutions. In the face of monetary inflation, declining markets, shifting social demands, and erratic enrollment patterns, higher education institutions must adopt modern business management techniques to survive. A key technique is strategic planning.

Although higher education institutions are unlike the business corporations which have a profit yardstick to measure results and can make decisions based on profit expectations, strategic planning has value for higher education institutions because in many ways they have become similar to business. Therefore, strategic planning in business can be modified to suit higher education settings.

A general model of the strategic planning process applied to higher education has been presented in six steps: environmental analysis, resource analysis, goals formulation, strategy formulation, organization design, and system design.

The success of implementation of strategic planning depends on the institution's ability to manage issues. Major issues in the implementation of strategic planning identified by Chan (1986) have been outlined. Therefore, the issues management process must be linked to the strategic planning process in order to be more effective.

Four research studies on the application of strategic planning in higher education were reviewed.

Baldrige and Deal's (1983) study makes four important points in the process of implementing strategic planning: environmental monitoring, administrative leadership, organizational climate, and problem areas monitoring.

Tack and Heberlein's (1986) research outlines six principles in the implementation of strategic planning: (a) The strategic planning framework must be developed in sufficient time. (b) Planning must be inextricably linked with other managerial processes. (c) Planning must be realistic and capable of being implemented. (d) The paranoia of some faculty must be recognized. (e) The framework must be "sold" within the political context of the institution. (f) Administrative officials must be committed to the process.

Chan's (1986) study suggests that the successful implementation of strategic planning requires the support and participation of faculty members. Four strategies were used for increasing faculty involvement: (a) actively involving faculty in the clarification of the university's mission, (b) strengthening the faculty governance body, (c) enhancing faculty vitality through responsive resource allocation and infrastructure, and (d) employing multiple means of communication and consultation.

Finally, Chaffee's (1984) study finds that both "adaptive" and "interpretive" models --successful strategic planning models in higher education, are best used together.

Commentary

Business corporations and higher education institutions are open systems which are dependent upon their external environments and on the internal effects of demographic changes. Organizations always change through adaptation and planned change. However, traditional planned change often fails to deal with the multiple complexities of the changing environment. Therefore, strategic planning has arisen and evolved in response to changing environmental conditions and managerial problems.

The business world has engaged in strategic planning for many years. Pressures to do so come primarily from competition and the need to make resource allocation decisions. The corporations look ahead, decide where they realistically want to be in the future, and create plans that will chart the course of action necessary to achieve the objectives. The corporation's strategic plan focuses on marketing, production, and financing plans, which emphasize economic returns.

Under the pressures of monetary inflation, declining markets, shifting social demands, and erratic enrollment patterns, higher education institutions to survive in the 1980s, have adopted strategic planning from business corporations. Higher education institutions are complex organizations. Unlike business corporations which have a profit yardstick to measure results and can make decisions based on profit expectations, higher education institutions must attempt to measure academic quality and level of service.

Academic strategic planning emphasizes those basic principles that define worthwhile states of existence and the acceptable modes of behavior for a knowledge-based association of people. Like the business corporations, the higher education institutions must become market-focused. They should consider carefully what their students demand and how best they can marshal their resources to meet those desires.

Simply defined, strategic planning is the process through which an institution reviews current objectives and evaluates possible changes in them to determine how they

can best be achieved over a realistic period of time, given an assessment of the external environment and of institutional strengths and weaknesses. Strategic planning attempts to ensure performance accountability via a comparison between institutional activity and institutional objectives--it compares present behavior with an ideal state. Throughout the planning process, attention is given to the external environment and internal organizational climate.

Strategic planning is a departure from previous traditional planning in that it concentrates on the changing environment surrounding the institution as much as it pays attention to internal hopes and needs. It analyzes the threats and opportunities from the emerging demography, technology, economic and financial trends, political and legal developments, international conditions, and the concerns for changing values and quality of life. It matches departmental and collegiate wish lists with the probable realities of the society that higher education institutions hope to serve. Strategic planning tries to find an appropriate strategy for forward movement and success, consistent with faculty initiative and goals.

Strategic planning focuses on the institution's destiny and ultimate mission, with particular reference to its place in the external environment. Constituency, market, and competing organizations are salient features of the strategic mentality. Strategic planning belongs to key executives, not the planning office. Strategic planning has other features: its time perspective is medium or short-range; it uses an open systems perspective, and it welcomes both qualitative and quantitative information; its key objective is a stream of "wise" decisions, rather than a plan bound in a volume to be forgotten.

Business literature suggests an eight-step normative model of the strategic planning process while higher education literature suggests a modified six-step general model. Based on a comparison of the two models, one distinction of the latter is, instead of developing mission, establishing objectives, and formulating goals as the first step of the process, it conducts analyses of current situations and environments. Further, instead of

developing strategic alternatives as the fifth step of the process, it focuses on the organization design, such as structure, people, and culture in particular, to successfully implement the strategies.

Literature reveals that successful strategic planning in higher education requires a culture in which there is a sense of shared mission. Higher education institutions do not need to move as fast as businesses--their environments are relatively stable, and they can change more gradually with no ill effect. Filtering out choices is not as detrimental as it would be in a highly competitive business situation. Ignoring certain options provides stability, which reassures the professorate, helps guarantee morale and commitment, and reduces conflict, and also contributes to the effectiveness of the situation.

Business strategies are often recommended because they help shape the external environment, making it more conducive to success. For higher education institutions, which operate in relatively stable external environments, it is the internal environment which is crucial to success. It seems sensible, therefore, to select strategies that will beneficially shape the internal context. This means adopting incremental improvements that will protect morale, commitment, and a sense of shared mission and which can be implemented within the complex higher education institution structure.

This main point mentioned-above is also supported by the differences of identifying and managing issues in the process of designing and implementing strategic planning between business and higher education in the literature.

McGinnis (1984) contends that the success of strategic planning in business depends on the corporation's ability to manage effectively the issues of intelligence--to scan and interpret its external and internal environments; balance--to maintain balance between a centralized and decentralized decision-making process; analysis--to evaluate a problem using qualitative and quantitative information; innovation--to learn to do something it did not do before or to learn not to do something that it formally did; proactivity--to shape its

environment with new products, technologies, and administrative techniques; and risk-taking--to take bold and venturesome action in the face of uncertainty.

Meanwhile, Chan (1986) identifies six key issues in the process of designing and implementing strategic planning in higher education as: maintaining an organizational balance between a centralized and decentralized decision making process; ensuring compatibility between that strategic planning model and the institutional culture; emphasizing an action orientation; involving line managers in developing plans; making incremental improvements as opposed to strategic leaps; and integrating planning and budgeting.

It is obvious that strategic planning in business emphasizes environmental analysis, innovation, and risk-taking while strategic planning in higher education emphasizes organizational culture, line managers' involvement, and incremental improvements.

Studies of strategic planning in business show that strategic planning has become an integral part of the decision process in corporations. Strategic planning is a dynamic process which plays a crucial role in the management of business corporations. The studies emphasize the fact that the support from the top management is most important for the success of strategic planning efforts. On the other hand, the corporations need to develop an understanding of the role of strategic planning and the necessity of a suitable environment to support strategic planning. The studies suggest that better corporations, the more successful, or more profitable ones place a greater emphasis upon planning over a two- to five- year time horizon. A good strategic planning process is both bottom-up in getting everyone involved and top-down, therefore ensuring vitality and usefulness.

Studies of the application of strategic planning in higher education identified the major points in the process of developing and implementing strategic planning as: time must be sufficient to develop strategic planning; planning must be realistic and acceptable; environmental monitoring, administrative leadership, institutional culture and climate, and the support and participation of faculty members are the most important factors for

successful strategic planning; and adaptive and interpretive models are successful strategic planning models in higher education.

Strategic planning, like other aspects of successful leadership, is never finished. However, successfully implementing strategic planning is a rewarding process. Procedural outcomes can be achieved from it. It is an effective means by which to build a continuous process of self-renewal into an organization.

Strategic planning is a very appealing process in most organizations. In fact, it is so appealing that it is difficult to develop a logical argument against it. However, the fact that there are so many positive benefits to be gained from it does not mean that strategic planning will automatically succeed. Major issues should be considered and managed when implementing strategic planning.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter presents the theoretical orientation which provides the foundation for the research methodology of this study. The inquiry approach adopted for this research was interpretive and qualitative. This chapter also provides a detailed discussion of case study methodology and the process of data collection and analysis, and concludes with a discussion of measures employed to ensure trustworthiness of this study's findings.

Interpretive Paradigm

Social scientists view the world differently, and the meta-theoretical assumptions they hold about the nature of science and society underlie their fundamental differences. Depending upon the ontological and epistemological assumptions they hold about the social world and human knowledge, social scientists may be located on a map of four world views of paradigms: radical humanist, radical structuralist, interpretive and functionalist (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 23). Others, like Guba (1985) simply refer to two contrasting views: positivistic and naturalistic.

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) posit that a paradigm is "a loose collection of logically held-together assumptions, concepts, or propositions that orient thinking and research" (p. 30). The research orientation adopted for this study can be placed in the interpretive or naturalistic paradigm. The interpretive paradigm is informed by a concern to understand the world as it is, to understand the fundamental nature of the social world at the level of subjective experience. It seeks explanation within the realm of individual consciousness and subjectivity, within the frame of reference of the participant as opposed to the observer.

of action (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p. 28). It has evolved "as a way of 'understanding' people and the meaning behind their activities" (Williams, 1986, p. 1) through anthropology, sociology, and other disciplines. The interpretive paradigm was deemed suitable for this study because it fits both the nature of the problems under investigation and suggests an appropriate methodology.

Case Study Approach

This study is descriptive in nature, the objective being to illuminate the strategic planning process in the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta, therefore, a case study approach was deemed most appropriate. This is in accordance with Bogdan and Biklen's (1982) definition of a case study as "a detailed examination of one setting, or one single subject, or one single depository of documents, or one particular event" (p. 58), and Stake and Easley's (1978) description of the case study as "a study of a bounded system, emphasizing the unity and wholeness of that system, but confining the attention to those aspects that are relevant to the research problem at the time" (p. 31).

Hofferbert (1974) points out the strengths of the case study approach including its richness of detail and the lucidity it can provide in the "illumination" of a process of policy making: "Case studies have informed us greatly about the mechanisms of policy making" (p. 258). Merriam (1985) stated:

The case study offers a framework for investigating complex social units containing multiple variables. Grounded in a real life context, the case study as a holistic, life-like account offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand the experiences of its readers. (p. 210)

Yin (1984) quotes from Schramm (1971) that "the essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result" (pp. 22-23).

Guba and Lincoln (1981) describe the characteristics of the case study approach as follows:

1. a case study provides "thick description";
2. a case study is holistic, presenting a picture;
3. a case study is focused;
4. a case study illuminates meanings, focusing the reader's attention; and
5. a case study builds on the "tacit knowledge" of its readers. This gives a sense of the actual substance of the events (pp. 371-373).

These characteristics make the case study approach one of the many qualitative research methods that bases its interpretation of the subjects on their point of view and provides descriptive data allowing a view of the world as the participants see it.

The case study emphasizes one situation and often one aspect of the situation, but it must go beyond one observer's view of the situation, or even a view built from interviews by the researcher to describing the richness, the variety of perspectives held for the actions and interactions by the participants. The case study then, from an interpretive perspective opens up the situation to the possibilities and options inherent in the situation rather than the majority view as determined by the researcher.

In this research, a case study approach was used to examine how the Faculty of Education developed and implemented a strategic planning project from November, 1985 to November, 1989. The case study approach was deemed particularly suited for this study of the strategic planning process of a single organization. The Faculty of Education, in spite of consisting of different units, constitutes one organization. Further, as Herriott and Gross (1979) posit, this method, "constitutes a highly useful mechanism to describe and analyze the complexities and realities of change efforts and the personal, social, and cultural factors that influence them" (pp. 353-54).

In order to capture the complexities of the strategic planning process, the case study approach was adopted as a method of inquiry and the descriptive narrative technique of a case study was employed in the writing of this dissertation.

Methodology and Data Collection

This study is intentionally unstructured in the research design, in keeping with the accepted pattern in qualitative research in order to "maximize discovery and description" (McCall & Simmons, 1969, p. 1). However, as Schatzman and Strauss (1973) indicate, although field research does not need an operational design, it does require a set of strategies for data collection and analysis (p. 145). In this study, two research methods, documentary review and interviews, formed the major data sources.

Documentary Data

Documentary review was the initial data collection stage that consisted of assembling and organizing documentary data. Lawler, Nadler, and Cammann (1980) posit that the richest source of unobtrusive data is the various documents, records, and written material that are in the possession of the organization. This kind of non-reactive data makes a major contribution to organizational studies.

Documentary review in this study includes analysis of documents, such as newsletters, reports on the Strategic Planning Project, minutes of the Education Faculty Council, official correspondence, and special reports on meetings. The documentary review also covered other sources, which included books, articles in journals, special and personal reports, position papers, briefs on programs, the published research by fellow academics in related disciplines and news clippings, and news bulletins from various related organizations with relation to the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project.

Permission to access documents was obtained from the Coordinator of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. All the documents in relation to the Strategic Planning Project were located in the researcher's department, therefore it was very easy for the researcher to review them at any convenient time. Some related documents which were not available in the Strategic Planning Office, were located in the Office of the Dean of Education. All the documentary data were arranged in a chronological order with sub-headings (appendix 4). Understandings developed from the documentary search and literature review, incorporated with the research problems and sub-problems, were used to design interview questions.

Interviews

The interview is one of the major research techniques employed by social scientists (Dexter, 1970; Denzin, 1978). Denzin (1978) believes that the interview "remains (and rightly so) the basic source of sociological data. The interview may be complemented by other methods ... but it will never be replaced" (p. 89).

The forms of the interview vary from a highly structured format to an open-ended, unstructured one that employs neither fixed questions nor a pre-determined order for asking questions. In this study, the interviews provided information, not available in documentary sources, which assisted in interpreting findings obtained from the documents as well as providing a means of cross validation. The interviews, meant to stimulate recollections of specific past events, also helped to identify new questions that arose in the course of discussion about which the opinions of the respondents were solicited.

Identification of the Interviewees: The purposive sampling technique was used to choose interviewees. According to Bailey (1982), purposeful sampling is the strategy in which "the researcher uses his or her own judgement about which respondents to choose, and picks only those who best meet the purpose of the study" (p. 99). The interviewees were selected on the basis of their involvement in the development of the strategic planning

under investigation, their knowledge of the topic, the depth of involvement, the likelihood of a wide range of views, their proximity to the Strategic Planning Project of the Faculty of Education, and their willingness to be interviewed.

The interviewees were (1) the present Dean of the Faculty of Education, (2) Coordinators of the Strategic Planning Project, (3) representatives of the stakeholder groups, (4) people who were heavily involved in the procedures of the Project, and (5) other Faculty and administrative staff.

The interviewees were all contacted by correspondence (Appendix 1), and the purpose of the study was explained to them. Those who agreed to participate signed a formal consent form (Appendix 2). A follow-up phone call or personal face-to-face contact was made to make an appointment for the appropriate interview time.

Conducting the Interviews: Interviews were carried out using a semi-structured format which helped explore broad problems or research questions. A predetermined list of questions, originally developed from the research questions, the literature, and the documentary search was used as the interview guide (Appendix 3). This method facilitated the free flow of conversation, aided by probing questions from the interviewer. In addition, open-ended questions were asked in order to elicit an optimal amount of information and to explore new questions that arose spontaneously during the interview.

As Ary (1985) points out

the open-ended question is preferred for more complex questions where the researcher is interested in identifying the subject's understanding of an issue, the frame of reference used in responding, or motivations underlying the response. (p. 343)

This technique also helped in obtaining opinions which were not possible to get using a questionnaire, especially when dealing with sensitive topics. For such purposes, each interviewee might have a very different contribution to make, depending on his or her position with respect to the problem under study. This means that each interviewee was given special non-standard treatment where the interviewee's definition of the situation was

stressed; the interviewee was encouraged to structure the account of the situation; and the interviewee was permitted to introduce his or her notions of what he or she regarded as relevant key decision instead of depending upon the interviewer's notions of relevance.

A modified progressive nomination technique was applied whereby informants were asked to recommend other potential informants who might or might not share their point of views but would have experience and ideas relative to the questions which were asked.

Altogether twenty-five formal interviews were conducted of forty-five to ninety minutes' duration. Most of the interviews were conducted in the offices of the informants. Two interviews were held at the informants' homes. The interviewees were told that the source of all the information provided in the interview would be kept confidential.

Prior to each interview, agreement was sought from each interviewee to have the interview taped. Some of the interviewees were selected for follow-up interviews in order to clarify ambiguities, or to raise further areas for discussion.

The first ten formal-taped interviews were transcribed by the researcher himself and then checked by a professional typist, and the last fifteen interviews were transcribed by the professional typist and checked by the researcher twice. More than 800 pages (double space) of transcriptions were generated and coded in order to preserve anonymity.

In sum, the emphasis in data collection was shifted from documentary sources to data derived from the interviews. While the documentary sources helped in identifying interview questions, the information gathered through interviews led the researcher back to documents and other literature. Consequently, there was a constant shift from one type of data source to another.

Processing and Interpreting Data

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) described the procedures of data analysis for qualitative research as follows:

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others. Analysis involves the working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others (p. 145).

This study followed these procedures in its data analysis. Due to the flexibility of the research design, data analysis was an ongoing part of the investigatory process. It was undertaken both during and subsequent to data collection.

First of all, the documentary data were arranged in a chronological order and placed in separate files. A detailed chronological list of the events of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project from November of 1985 to November of 1989 was made and entered on the computer.

Secondly, the researcher started to read and to make notes on each of the interview transcripts while listening carefully to the tape. Then, each transcript was broken into small units. The contents of the small units included the historical overview of each event, the procedure of the Strategic Planning Project and each interviewee's ideas, reflections, comments, understandings, interpretations, and predictions of the event. These small units were added to the event list where appropriate. Subsequently, the event list became a two hundred and forty page (single space) document. Throughout this process the researcher engaged in a careful reflective analysis of the data and the identification of potential themes, issues and theories. The event list was further examined to identify each event and the varying understandings connected with the event. This list was then circulated to each participant asking that any inaccuracies or gaps in the data be identified (Appendix 6). Then confirmation of these topics allowed the researcher to return to the event list which then became the basis for the following chapters of this dissertation.

Research Trustworthiness

Guba's (1980) four aspects of research trustworthiness--credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability--were used as a guide in developing the interview format and in doing the documentary search.

Credibility is the degree of confidence in the findings of a particular inquiry. The crucial concern in qualitative research is whether the researcher's analyses and interpretations reflect the respondents' views and perceptions. Triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checks have been recommended by Guba and Lincoln (1981) to ensure credibility.

The proponents of naturalistic inquiry discount generalizability but agree that transferability is possible. To ensure transferability, purposive sampling (Guba, 1981) and "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) are recommended. "Thick description" permits the making of "reasoned judgments" concerning the fit between the present and other contexts.

Dependability refers to stability of the data. To ensure dependability the research may employ triangulation or establish an audit trail which will permit another to examine the process whereby the data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

To ensure confirmability, Guba & Lincoln (1981) recommend that the researcher should employ triangulation. Thus triangulation stands as an assurance of methodological rigor to ensure credibility, dependability, and confirmability. Jick (1979) considers triangulation can also capture a more complete holistic and contextual portrayal of the units under study. The use of multiple measures may also uncover some unique variance which otherwise may have been neglected by single methods (p. 603). Guba and Lincoln (1981) add that the process of triangulation permits "multiple value perspectives to emerge from the same context or event." These "multiple value perspectives then become warp and weft of the contextual fabric" which the researcher uncovers in the course of checking his "facts" (p. 257).

This study attempted to cross-validate and ensure the credibility of information by using multiple and varied data sources through a triangulation process. Interviews from different people in relation to the same issue, official and non-official data, perceptions of insiders as well as outsiders were triangulated to ensure credibility and confirmability. The purposive sampling technique was used when key informants were asked for other knowledgeable persons to ensure transferability. Credibility was also assured because of member checks and peer debriefing. In this study, a formal member check occurred in the middle of the data analysis when the informants responded to the total set of synopses of the transcripts. On the other hand, the researcher held regular meetings with a classmate to discuss the relevancy, meanings and interpretations of the data from a substantive and methodological perspective. This peer debriefing provided an external check on the process of data collection and analysis. Dependability of this research was ensured through triangulation and an audit trail. During the period of data analysis the researcher's supervisor examined the process frequently.

Ethical Considerations

This study followed the ethical guidelines established by the University of Alberta General Faculties Council and by the Department of Educational Administration. The major source of data for this study is the human participant in the process of carrying out the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. Twenty-five faculty members and representatives of the stakeholder groups of the Faculty of Education were interviewed with regard to their involvement in, their perception of, and their reflection on the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project.

Since some of the informants interviewed held readily identifiable positions in the administration and implementation of the process of the Project, it was not always possible to ensure anonymity. However, the researcher took necessary steps to fully inform

respondents with regard to the purpose of the study, the purpose of the interview, and that their responses would be treated with confidentiality.

If the informant was directly quoted and specifically identified, special permission was sought. The accuracy of the information obtained through the interview and the researcher's interpretation were checked and confirmed by the informant.

As required by the ethics committee, the researcher has taken steps to ensure that the information presented in the final document of his dissertation would not bring any harm to the respondents.

Summary

This chapter outlined the methodology of this research in which the theoretical orientation of this research, the procedures and process of the data collection and analysis, the methods which were used to establish the trustworthiness of the research, and ethical considerations were included. A detailed discussion on case study methodology was also provided.

CHAPTER IV

RATIONALE, DESIGN, AND STRUCTURE

Introduction

As indicated in Chapter I, the question which directed this study was: On what basis did the Dean of the Faculty of Education decide to initiate a Strategic Planning Project and how was it carried out? The following subsidiary questions guided this study:

1. What were the major factors which influenced the Dean of the Faculty of Education to initiate the Strategic Planning Project?
2. What were the design and structure of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project?
3. How was the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project carried out?
 - a) What approaches and procedures were employed in the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
 - b) What outcomes resulted from the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
 - c) Who were involved in the process of the Strategic Planning Project and what was the nature of their involvement?

Based on these questions, Chapter IV contains the reasons for the initiation of the Strategic Planning Project and describes the evolution of the design and structure of the Project. Chapter V portrays how the Project was developed and carried out and describes the outcomes which resulted from the process. Chapter VI presents discussions on the major themes and issues which emerged from the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project in relation to the literature on strategic planning.

The main purpose of this chapter is to address the first two research questions: why the Dean wanted to establish the Strategic Planning Project; how was it designed, and what

structure was set up for carrying it out. The following sections of this chapter focus on these questions.

Rationale for the Project

According to the interview and documentary data, the factors which influenced the Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta to initiate the Faculty Self Study (later, called the Faculty Planning Study, and finally entitled the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project) include pressures and demands external and internal to the Faculty.

Impact of University Strategic Planning and PACCR Study

In the fall of 1985, the Dean of the Faculty of Education asked three faculty members to propose a design for a Faculty of Education Self Study. This Proposal was submitted to the Dean on November 25, 1985. The rationale for initiating this Self Study states that:

Each of the six departments of the Faculty of Education has been reviewed through the PACCR (the President/Advisory Committee on Campus Reviews) process. Although these reviews have been very valuable to each of the departments and to the faculty -- in respect to departmental operations -- they have not examined all areas of concern to the Faculty. Therefore, a review of the Faculty of Education has been requested. (Ingram, McIntosh, & Worth, 1985, p. 1)

In April of 1986, this proposal was revised and the Self Study was renamed the Faculty Planning Study by two Coordinators of the Study. Therefore, the original rationale was modified:

In 1983 the University launched an ambitious and comprehensive strategic planning effort to help shape its future. The initial outcome of this effort is the document entitled *The Next Decade and Beyond: A Plan for the Future*. Concurrently, five of the six departments of the Faculty of Education have been reviewed through the PACCR process. Although these reviews have been very valuable to each of the departments they have not examined all matters of concern to the Faculty. Nor were these reviews undertaken within the context of the overall plan which is intended to guide the

University in its development. Therefore, a planning study of the Faculty of Education is being undertaken. (Ingram, 1986, p. 1)

As indicated above, the primary reason that the Dean decided to introduce the Faculty of Education Self Study or Planning Study was the influence of the University Strategic Planning Study and PACCR Reviews.

Specifically, in 1983, after Dr. Patterson became the Dean of the Faculty of Education, the University of Alberta started its Strategic Planning Study: *The Next Decade and Beyond* and he was invited to chair one of the committees of the University Planning Study. As he participated in that process, he realized that "many of the kinds of issues that the University was dealing with were ones that the Faculty needed to consider at its level as well."

Concurrently, the University started its PACCR Study and the Dean was assigned to sit on the Academic Development Committee. From this process, he observed that "as these various PACCR Studies were being completed in the departments of the Faculty that there was something missing by looking at the Faculty through each of the six separated departments." Therefore, the Dean started to think of having a Faculty Self Study to look at the Faculty as a whole.

As one informant recalled, "because I had previously been the Dean, the current Dean talked with me on couple of occasions about this kind of study [PACCR] whether it was useful to the Faculty and so on." He shared with the current Dean his view that the major reason for establishing the Faculty Self Study was that the Faculty as an entity was more than the sum of the parts of its constituent units. Although each department of the Faculty had undertaken the PACCR Reviews, all those reviews together did not give a picture of the total Faculty. Therefore, the Faculty Self Study would fill in the gaps between the department studies and look at those activities and those functions that embraced the total Faculty. It would go beyond any one department and try to develop a comprehensive picture of the Faculty in operation as distinct from just looking at each of its constituent units.

One informant who used to be an Associate Dean recollected that

It was in the fall of 1985, when the Dean, first of all, began to wonder about the possibility of having a faculty review, something like the PACCR Reviews of the departments, we actually had a meeting with the PACCR group to get their sense of how a study in the Faculty might be carried on within the framework of PACCR. As I recall the outcome of that meeting was first, the members of that committee were interested in having the Faculty of Education do something. They, the PACCR group, did not have a model that they could propose to the Faculty of Education. But they encouraged the Dean to proceed and expressed the hope that maybe, since no other faculties had been reviewed at the faculty level that whatever the Faculty of Education did would be useful to them in working with other faculties.

One informant who prepared the original proposal for the Faculty Self Study also mentioned that the PACCR process caused the Dean to initiate the Faculty Self Study, "I think the Dean felt that although the various departments of the Faculty evaluated themselves, these evaluations didn't add up to a total evaluation of the Faculty." The Coordinators of the Planning Study indicated that the University Planning Study *The Next Decade and Beyond*, was undoubtedly one of the "catalytic forces" and the PACCR Study was a "spark" for the Dean to develop the concept of having a Self Study to review the Faculty.

The other informants interviewed explained their perceptions. Some of them thought that since the Dean chaired one of the committees of the University Planning Study which created the document *The Next Decade and Beyond*, he was involved from a planning perspective for the University. They felt that, as an educational leader, that would have created some pressures on him to think about doing something in terms of long-range planning for the Faculty. Some considered that the University of Alberta had become interested in planning again and, given *The Next Decade and Beyond* as an example, planning was becoming a part of its culture, part of the general University climate. "The Dean and his other people believe that the Faculty needs this kind of planning," said one professor.

Reflecting upon the impact of the University Planning Study and PACCR Reviews, the Dean summarized the situation of the Faculty and pointed out the necessity of the planning study:

What I was seeing in the Faculty was that we were still doing many of the things we used to do, but there were many new demands that were being placed upon us [from the University Planning Study]. New programs that we were being encouraged to respond to; the University asked us to look at more graduate enrollment; great responsibility for research; there were all these kinds of new pressures and expectations that were before us, and the Faculty. I thought, the Faculty was having a hard time sorting out on which of these needs to place the greatest priority. And so, I saw reason for us to engage in that kind of study, just to sort out some of those priorities.

Political and Stakeholder Demands

The Dean spoke of the political and stakeholder demands upon his thinking of initiating the Faculty Self Study. Since the time he started his deanship, a number of criticisms were being voiced about teacher education and about the role of the Faculty of Education. "For instance, during that period of time, there had been one Minister of Education, Mr. King, who had tried to look at teacher education in the Province and to make some changes, his Deputy Minister had been very critical of Faculties of Education." The Dean wanted the Faculty members to try to attend to some changes before they were really forced upon them.

One stakeholder representative who had been heavily involved in the Faculty Planning Study pointed out that:

Over the last ten, maybe even fifteen years, there has been continuous pressure from the Alberta Teachers' Association, some pressures from the Alberta Trustees' Association and from the Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association, and some pressures from students for changes in the Faculty of Education. I think that if you were to look at written submissions that these different agencies made, certainly submissions that the Alberta Teachers' Association made, these submissions almost continuously called for a review and change in approach in the Faculty of Education.

A former Dean of the Faculty noted that one of the purposes of this Self Study was to demonstrate to stakeholder agencies that the Faculty was taking account of some of their

criticisms. The Faculty was prepared to evaluate itself and wanted to change and improve, so that its image to agencies, individuals, and groups external to the Faculty whether they were from other sectors of the University, or from the Alberta Teachers' Association, or from the government, would be enhanced. Further, through this study, the need for additional resources, financial resources for staff or whatever was necessary to pursue some of the objectives of the Faculty which would be identified. This Self Study, therefore, was intended to identify objectives for improvement and to provide a justification or a rationale to request appropriate resources to fulfill them.

Financial and Economic Pressures

Various interviewees considered that the economic and financial pressures upon the Faculty were an important reason for setting up the Faculty Planning Study. The Dean, himself, stressed "at the same time that our resources were in decline, there were increasing pressures on us for expansion of service and increased productivity." One faculty member referred to the fact that in Alberta, where universities relied on public monies from government for their existence, the value of resources for education had been shrinking.

He pointed out:

Unfortunately, the university system here runs in cycles; when the economy was booming, then the University was booming; when the economy was down, then the University was down; so the universities are now competing in a growing arena for the money that had been collected by government, and that means the universities and their respective faculties are going to have to plan fairly clearly what it is they're trying to achieve and what their long-range objectives are.

One informant indicated that the time when the Faculty Self Study was being conceived was a time of dropping student enrollment and dropping resources, a common problem to which many deans had to react. One informant, reflecting on the financial pressure upon the Faculty, expressed his feeling:

The Faculty of Education is at the cross roads. It has been suffering under budgetary restraint for number of years which is causing two kinds of problems: one is a morale problem, and the other kind of problem is ad hoc

decisions. We respond on year by year basis. We make the cuts which we can figure out how to make that year, hoping next year will be better, but next year is bad and we have to make another cut. So we have been repairing the size of the Faculty on a piecemeal basis year by year. I think the Dean wanted a process that was to establish a way of providing direction to the Faculty so the decisions could be made in a more forceful way. If the Faculty sat down and said, "here is where we are, here is where we want to go," then the Dean could make the budgetary decisions in the light of certain directions of the Faculty.

One faculty member reflected these sentiments, commenting that in the last decade, the Faculty of Education had lost thirty-three staff members, so it had fewer and fewer resources to do the work of the Faculty. "I think if you were Dean and you saw thirty-three professors were gone, you'd start thinking about 'How do I use the ones that I have left in the best way?'" On the other hand, it was pointed out that the document *The Next Decade and Beyond* placed very little priority on the professional faculties like the Faculty of Education. So long as the budgets were cut, the Faculty of Education was likely to be cut more than some of the higher-priority faculties. "I think the Dean is in a difficult place and he was trying to get us to set priorities and to consciously identify some things as our most important tasks so that we could use our resources more wisely," said the informant.

Social, Demographic, and Technological Trends

The University Planning Study examined the demographic trends and set up the future size of the University and the priorities for graduate and undergraduate programs. This had implications for the Faculty. In recent years, the undergraduate enrollments, while essentially stable in total numbers, were increasing in the senior years of the programs. On the other hand, the economic slowdown in Alberta caused an alleged oversupply of teachers in the Province. The Dean felt that these were questions that the Faculty of Education needed to address so as to position itself appropriately.

In connection with the continuing expansion in knowledge, the Dean considered that one of the challenges that the Faculty faced was whether it could keep adding to its programs to meet these demands or it had to withstand that incrementalism and rethink the

way to prepare its graduate and undergraduate students. Technological change might be a part of that issue of concern, but the real issue was the rapidly expanding knowledge of the world and the teaching profession in particular.

In reaction to the social demand, the Dean pointed out that in the United States there were three major studies in education that were causing a ferment about teacher education: the study *A Nation at Risk*, the *Carnegie Report* on teachers for the twenty-first century, and the *Holmes Report* which came out with a proposal for changing teacher education. The Dean did not wish to merely replicate these studies and he asserted that "I didn't want us to just try to imitate these or somehow adopt pieces of them. I wanted us to come to our own, to look at our circumstances and conditions and see what could be done to improve and change."

To Create an Impetus for Change

The Dean had been the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Education before he became the Dean. During that period, the last major program revision of the Faculty of Education at the undergraduate level had been held. Looking back on it, the Dean reflected:

I was unhappy with my own involvement. Once the committee had done all of the work and prepared the report, in some senses, we became more concerned with trying to sell that to the rest of the faculty rather than to find a way to involve the faculty so they would fully understand that and catch the spirit of those changes. And so, when I decided to take this planning study on, I want the process to be such that it causes us to change. I don't want just coming in with the report and then taking a few formal steps and saying, "Well, we've changed, we've done our thing." Somehow, I want us to engage in activities that would get us to think differently about ourselves and what we could do.

One informant echoed the Dean's sentiment, "the Dean is trying to stimulate change in the Faculty, unquestionably, it's a major motivating force." He felt that the Dean's idea of moving forward with the review of the Faculty as a whole was coming from that experience as an Associate Dean that he had in the 1970s, and from the standpoint of reviewing the B. Ed. degree program. "I think he felt he had some success with that and

that he might contribute, in a leadership way, to change within the Faculty of a more mega kind."

The Dean expressed his personal concern about the Faculty that it was too easy to stagnate and to become complacent and self-satisfied and to believe that the Faculty was doing everything well or effectively, "because this Faculty of Education has a very favorable reputation in the country, it made it even easier for us to rest on previous performance and I wanted us to make sure of that if we were becoming complacent and if we were still a leadership institution." As one faculty member observed, it was long overdue that the organization of the Faculty should be looked at. "I think we have some anomalies, it is always a good thing to examine where the organization is and where it ought to be in the future." He continued,

... there are problems in the Faculty and they can be dealt with possibly under the umbrella of the strategic planning function, problems such as that our configuration of six departments hasn't changed since somewhere in the 1960s; that our structure is at least twenty years old; and that it may have outlived its usefulness. That's with respect to the six departments, there may be a further problem in the structure as far as the supporting divisions are concerned. So, I think there is the general reason, a very plausible reason that it's a good thing to look at what you are doing, and look at your structure.

One department chair's perception was quite agreeable with that of the above faculty member, "When the Dean said that he would like to have a unit-review of the Faculty, I thought that was a good idea because it's an opportunity to see where we are at, what we are doing, where we might be going." Another department chair noted that "this unit-review of the strategic planning process allows you to look ahead and make plans in a certain direction that focuses that change."

To Build Faculty Level Commitment

Another reason that the Dean wanted to bring up the Faculty Self Study was to encourage the Faculty members to build commitment and loyalty to the Faculty. The Dean saw that, in this University, people had gained more and more independence of action.

Instructors were left a great deal of latitude and freedom in what they did and in what they taught. Their loyalty tended to be at the level of their departments which in the University and Faculty were very strong and independent units. The Dean noted that other faculties were expected to bring their different interests together, and so he wanted to encourage the Faculty of Education members to develop a sense of belonging and loyalty to the Faculty, just as they needed to have loyalty to departments or to the large University itself.

Therefore, part of the emphasis upon the Faculty Self Study was to try to rekindle or to build a commitment to the Faculty rather than just at the level of the department or the individual teaching areas. The Dean indicated, "that was a personal agenda of my own."

One former Dean of Education shared with the present Dean his view that one of the reasons was

... to try to promote the feeling of the Faculty and belief of the Faculty and an allegiance to the Faculty, as opposed to saying, "I am in the Department of (xxx xxx)," "I am a member of the Faculty of Education." So, there was a kind of morale, psychological, political theme that worked here to try to get people to think of themselves as a Faculty member rather than a department member. Because when you've got people to think that way and could get that kind of commitment from them, then they are more apt to support the Faculty goals.

Without this kind of commitment to the Faculty, as observed by one of the members of the Faculty Planning Study,

... some of our staff members in this Faculty might feel more like they're in Graduate Studies, and they don't feel the same affinity to Education, because that has a certain status, quality in their minds, that "Here we're Graduate Studies, and that's so much more important than Undergraduate Studies; That here we're Graduate Studies, we deal with Master's and Doctoral students and with research," that kind of orientation, which has done more damage to the cause of education and the Faculty than many other concepts.

He concluded, "so our recommendations [for the Planning Study] hit at that, and I think one of the problems about bringing about change is that change really could change the attitudes and orientation of these people."

To Develop a Consensus on Faculty's Mission

Many faculty members perceived that in order to have the people change their attitude and orientation and increase commitment to the Faculty, the Dean was trying to use the process of the Planning Study to build a consensus, "not a consensus on where we're at, but maybe a consensus on where we should be," as one informant remarked. One Faculty member thought that the Dean was trying to create a vision through the Planning Study process. "I think he was hoping this process in terms of strategic planning might provide a vehicle for creating a commonly held vision that would have some consensus around it."

One department chair related one of the reasons which had pushed the Dean to do this planning study. The Faculty had been struggling with the mission and objectives of the Faculty for a long time and "the Chairs were pushing the Dean to say, 'What is our mission? Where are we going? What is the Chair? And everyone in our Faculty Council was coming out and asking 'Where are we going? Why are we going there? What are our objectives? What is our mission?'"

One informant gave the Dean credit for setting up this Planning Study so that it provided opportunity for a much broader involvement of the Faculty as a whole than any other projects undertaken. It can create a sense of mission, a sense of purpose, basically, for all participants in the Faculty, and I know how difficult that is in an academic institution where there are a lot of free spirits floating around, but I think that certainly there would be some value in looking at a core value statement. I think there will be a step made in this planning endeavor in the Faculty of Education to get there.

A Possible Hidden Agenda

Some faculty members speculated that the Dean had a hidden agenda up his sleeve, wondering whether it was really a study of the organization of the Faculty in which some of the departments would change their size and shape or perhaps be amalgamated or shifted around. One informant explained that there had been a committee about a dozen years ago, on which the present Dean served, while he was a staff member. The Committee had as its goal to examine the six departments, the Dean's Office, and the support divisions such as

the Division of Educational Research. The Committee did a lot of work, interviewing staff members, having people come from the departments to make their case with the Committee. "I do remember Patterson [the Dean] was on the committee which was interested in the possibility of reshaping the Faculty and combining a department or two, perhaps combining some of the support services, especially the ones that pertained to information systems for educational research," one faculty member recollected. The Dean also remembered, "when Dr. Horowitz became Dean, we undertook a long range planning study at that time. After it had been many months on it, I guess, very little came from it. I can remember how disappointed I was when the report was tabled in our Faculty Council that said that we really didn't need to change." Therefore, one faculty member reflected upon this,

... so I'd a hunch at the back of my head that maybe the Dean now was taking the opportunity, now that he was a well established Dean-- [he] had been Dean for four or five years-- to reopen the question, because that committee way back when eventually moved on to other matters and stopped talking about organizational structure. It ceased functioning. It ran out of momentum and ground to a halt. So I had a hunch that there was a hidden, not a hidden agenda in that the Dean knew where he wanted the go, but that he wanted the question of the organization reopened.

The Dean sensed that perhaps many people thought that he had a hidden agenda such as a master plan at the back of his mind that he just wanted to impose on the Faculty. He explained this strongly by saying, "That wasn't my intent. I wanted the Faculty to be more creative, more imaginative about how to deal with these problems, I wanted the Faculty to be able to make those decisions. But I really didn't want to tell them what the answer was."

As described above, the external factors such as, political, financial, economic, social, demographic and technological pressures, and internal factors such as the need to change and to develop a Faculty level vision, mission, and commitment, were major forces which drove the Dean to start the Faculty Self Study. The next section describes how the design of this Study was developed.

Design of the Project

With regard to the model followed in designing the Faculty of Education Self Study, the Dean said, "I've learnt that from my own experience here, for instance, when I was the Associate Dean, I was responsible for that last program change. And when I look back on that, now what we are doing is to make sure that we don't do what we did the last time." As one informant observed,

I don't think this project was designed all at once and then sort of implemented from a pure design. I think it grew. I think there was an interaction between design and what had happened before and what was happening now and what was going to happen. I think it was designed in process. It started off with some concepts, and then some things happened, and then the next stage was designed from that, and then the next stage from that one. So I think it's more appropriate to talk about development of the project rather than design of the project.

Faculty of Education Self Study

Since the University had undertaken the PACCR Study and the Dean had worked on the Academic Development Committee, he spoke to the Chairman of the PACCR committee and met with the PACCR committee of the University and indicated to that committee that he was going to initiate the Faculty of Education Self Study. "I hoped that it might have some connection to the University PACCR study and that I would keep them informed, but it wasn't going to be under their direction, it was going to be under the Dean of Education's direction," the Dean pointed out. As well, one former Associate Dean noted,

Although the Dean saw that the Faculty of Education Self-Study should have been related to the PACCR Reviews, he didn't want to use exactly the same process as was used for PACCR Reviews. So I think he saw the study as being an adaptation of the PACCR Review project, but it was stimulated by same concern, motivated by the PACCR Reviews.

One informant commented that since each department had undertaken a PACCR Review, people had a basic understanding of what a self-study was. Looking at the PACCR process could help people understand and conceptualize the Self Study and gave people in

the early stages a conceptual model to which they could relate. Another informant suggested the agenda for the Self Study should be different from the PACCR Reviews. It should have more to do with setting an agenda for changing the Faculty rather than as in the PACCR Review looking at the past and evaluating the departments.

The Faculty Self Study was an outcome of those discussions with PACCR and more discussions within the Faculty, with the Associate Deans, and with some department chairs. Then, in the fall of 1985, the Dean asked three faculty members to prepare a proposal on how a Faculty Self Study might be carried out. The three faculty members all confirmed this fact. They submitted that proposal to the Dean on November 25, 1985.

One informant commented on this,

I think he [the Dean] put the Project in the hands of people he trusted and asked them to develop a design for it. I don't think Dr. Patterson [the Dean] tried to control the process himself. I think the intent was to get lots of people involved, not just those two or three, but to reach out widely into the Faculty and try and get as many people as possible involved in the process.

With respect to the proposal, one former Associate Dean indicated that it was not a highly public document. "I referred to it as a review because the initial discussions of it were within the context of thinking about it as a review of the Faculty very much like the review that had been done in the departments." However, the original Faculty of Education Self Study Proposed Design states:

The overall purpose of the Self Study phase of this review is to identify the issues facing the faculty, to consider alternative approaches to issue resolution and to develop procedures for moving toward resolution of these issues. (Ingram, McIntosh, & Worth, 1985, p. 1)

The scope of this study covered (1) the mission of the Faculty, (2) the organization of the Faculty, (3) the services provided, (4) internal and external relationships, and (5) the policies and programs of concern to the Faculty as a whole which were not specific to any one department.

In the proposed design, the timeline was established from January of 1986, when the Dean was announcing the Self Study Design, to April of 1988, when the final Report of

the Study was to be considered. As one informant who wrote the original proposal of the Study remembered,

I think we would have laid out phases for the study. There would be an initial stage which was largely descriptive, that is, describing how the Faculty saw itself and how people external to the Faculty saw it as revealed by the studies and documents and interviews with an attempt to lay out the trends within the Faculty in terms of enrollment, budget and so on. And in the second stage it's clearly an issue identification . . . and then the phase three would have been the exploration of these issues--four issues--areas to explore which intend to give direction to change within the Faculty. Phase four would be the implementation which the Dean would have to decide, how to proceed, how he was going to implement and keep the planning process going. I'm pretty sure that there was one difference, so we were supposing a study that would be done more quickly. I think we started in spring of 1986 and should be finished no later than the fall of 1988.

One informant indicated that when the Dean started the process he envisioned it as two years. However, the Dean had never carried on this kind of process before, and neither he nor anyone else had a clear idea of how long it would take to do the Self Study. Therefore, it had actually taken more than twice as long as the original timeline proposed.

Faculty of Education Planning Study

After approving the Faculty Self Study proposal, the Dean decided to move ahead with it. In April of 1986, he appointed two senior faculty members as the Coordinators, heading up the Self Study Team. The Dean recollected what he had told the Coordinators,

. . . one thing I said to them was whatever we do with this I want the process to be such that it causes us to change. I don't want just coming with the report and then taking a few formal steps and saying, "Well, we've changed, we've done our thing." Somehow, I want us to engage in activities that would get us to think differently about ourselves, what we could do. So, the fundamental instruction to them was that this just wasn't to be a project to say that we had done it, but it was a project that in the very way that it was structured and the way was undertaken was to try to open the Faculty up to a willingness to reconsider what it was doing; why it was doing, what it might be doing differently.

One Coordinator added that what the Dean asked was basically to identify issues facing the Faculty, to consider alternative resolution of issues, and to develop strategies for

issue resolution. "But, I took it from there and then put it into a strategic planning mode to do those things," explained the Coordinator,

And the design, naturally would be based on the approaches I took to these things. And that fits in very closely to a strategic planning approach. Here, these were things based on what the Dean [wanted], to identify, to describe the trends and current status of the Faculty in respect to its mission, etc., and a lot of these things were what the Dean wanted to know. He set out the purposes, the things he wanted to know were what we were doing; what the concerns were; what some of the possibilities might be for the future. So I took those, and then as far as the process was concerned, I moved it into a strategic planning process.

One faculty member who prepared the original proposal of the Faculty Self Study indicated, "the study only became a strategic planning study later. I think [the Coordinator] actually proposed that means after he had been asked to take the leadership of the project."

As a result, in April, 1986, the Project Coordinators changed the Faculty Self Study into the Faculty of Education Planning Study. One coordinator outlined the design of the Planning Study,

Basically, the design was this, and this fits the general overall flow of what strategic planning is. I often call it a rational planning model.

First thing was to take a look at ourselves; what we were doing; what problems people saw here; what issues they saw; in other words, to describe how we operate with the Faculty and what people inside the Faculty think and view, and their views and concerns, etc. So we decided we had to have an internal study of ourselves as background.

But at the same time, and then following is, in strategic planning what they call environmental scanning, we had to take a look externally: What about other people, our stakeholder groups out there--the teaching profession, government agencies that are concerned with education, trustee agencies? What's going on in the research community and else where?

And so, we decided we had to have two parallel studies to start with: one on ourselves, to describe ourselves; another which was really broken down into two parts, to find out what our community, our environment, our stakeholders thought about all of this and what was needed. And then, also, to take a look at what was happening in the field, the field of practice and research in other faculties of education. So that was the first part of the design. . . .

And then after that we were to take this material, the information, and pull it into saying, "Ok, what issues, on the basis of what we see ourselves as like, what we are doing, what are the views internally, what's happened outside our institution, how these people in the institution think about us,

what they think needs to be done? And then what's going on in practice and in research things?" Take all of that, and then look into the future and say, "What are the issues, then that we face as a faculty, that we must come to grips with and, solve in order that we can do the best possible job of fulfilling our mandate."

And then, going from the issues, we move from issues to think about what are some possible approaches to solving these problems and overcoming or successfully resolving the issues? So that was really all three, first of all, information gathering, identifying issues, and then looking at alternative ways of resolving issues. That's the sort of basic overall design or model that we agreed to, that would govern what we did.

Financial planning was not included in the design of the planning project, as one

Coordinator explained:

One of the reasons for it is because of the funny way that the budget operates here, so we left that because the budget within a university, how that's done is so complex, we just left it, because it's not a program kind of budget as so many things are in organizations today. It's based on how much did the Faculty get last year, and will they get a ten percent increase or not next year, or we'll have to pay a ten percent tax? And even now, the way that money is given within the University, within the Faculty, is not so much on the basis of programs; it's on the basis of each department will get money, and this is all based on what was given last year, so it's such a complex thing that I thought the best thing to do at this stage was to just not talk about budget.

In May of 1986, the Dean took the proposal of Faculty of Education Planning

Study to the Faculty Council and announced that the Planning Study was to be initiated.

As one faculty member remembered,

I am almost sure that he [the Dean] brought back the proposal to our Faculty Council. I think he acquainted everybody with the proposal. He brought it in May of 1986 to the Faculty of Education Council. And whether he brought it for information or whether he brought it for vote, that's an important point, I can't remember. If I can guess, I would say he brought simply for information. I think he brought it to the Faculty of Education Council and said "I'm going to do this." I don't think he asked whether he should do it.

As one of the Associate Deans recalled, "... to the best of my knowledge, it was never endorsed or approved by the Faculty other than in the sense that the Dean represents the Faculty. And he announced to the Faculty that there was going to be a strategic planning project."

In January of 1987, the Faculty Planning Study was entitled the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project by the Project Coordinators.

Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project

The Dean did not purport to be an expert on strategic planning, noting that, "while I used the title of strategic planning, I really don't know all of the ingredients of strategic planning. I am going to use it in a much more pragmatic way than the experts in strategic planning would use it." He continued, "I am going to pick some elements out of strategic planning and then I may pick elements of other themes as well, because my ultimate goal is organizational renewal."

One informant noted, "maybe he [the Dean] understood the term and knew the concept, but I don't think he had a firm grasp." He considered that the Dean was not recognized as a strategic planner but a planner from his role as a Dean, "I'm not so sure that he was a strategic planner before. He used strategies and so on in planning and all of that, but he was not an experienced strategic planner." In another faculty member's words, "Dean Patterson was thinking in terms of a 'faculty review', I'm absolutely convinced that that was the words that he related to." And he added, "I think somebody else sold him the idea of strategic planning, and I don't think that he was that comfortable with the terminology, and I don't think he sold it to the Faculty as hard as he could have."

One informant interviewed mentioned that the study was initiated by the Dean and it was his view that the Faculty needed to reexamine what it was doing and why it was doing that. "But as to why the particular name, 'strategic', it's just a popular term 'strategic planning'. They could have even called it 'planning' without the word 'strategic'; they could have called it by some other fancy name like 'Planning for the Twenty-First Century.'"

One Project Coordinator explained,

I think "Faculty Planning Study" was a informal term and as we got into more of the literature about planning and, in particular, as the Coordinator, because that was his area of expertise, and the literature was talking not only about planning, but about strategic planning, and so, this became a strategic planning project.

Another Coordinator highlighted the reason for entitling the Self Study the Strategic Planning Project,

Originally, when it first started at that time we hadn't had the name "strategic planning" on it. That came slightly later, then I expanded it. And it was that time when I drew up the more complete plan that I called it strategic planning. And the reason for it is because of the growth and development in the concept of strategic planning both in industry and government and it was beginning to get into university and college and educational circles. So I thought using the term, not only the term, but the whole concept of the strategic planning, may be the best approach to take. So that was where it got its main and general design.

Further, he explained,

This project was not really set up from the Dean's perspective to start with as a strategic planning approach to things, because the term, he may have heard of it, but he wasn't really acquainted with that too much. So this project really was a project to develop a strategic planning approach, and to look at it this way. Originally it was a project just to review, a faculty review, but, as we moved on, we changed it and said, "All right, the best way to do this over time is to adopt a strategic planning strategy and approach," so the project itself was an attempt to bring about a strategic planning approach to the Faculty.

When you look at strategic planning, if you adopt that approach, then one of the key things in there is that the higher level people in the organization, in this case, like the Dean and the department heads and even swinging into the President's Office, must be the key decision makers. They must give attention to all of these things, and running the strategic planning project must be a key role for them to do. That's strategic planning.

Now, in this project, it wasn't. In this project the key thing is with the Project Team, because what we were doing is trying to develop this kind of approach for the Faculty. So, only if the Faculty adopts these sorts of things and ways of operating, would you say that the faculty has moved into the strategic planning approach on an ongoing basis. But this project was just an attempt to explore and to get started a strategic planning mode of operations.

Then, this Coordinator pointed out the major differences between the Strategic Planning Project and previous planning studies, "many of the others didn't put as much attention on getting at and exploring the backgrounds as this kind of study did." Another difference was that, "you generally had your study team doing the study, they may interview people,

then they'd come up with sorts of things, but then they'd come up with specific recommendations of how and what the change would look like. So it's slower, involving people more, and the recommendations themselves are more of a process of putting things into place than specific recommendations for change." He continued,

You can come up with great recommendations to do things, but unless people agree with that and make them feel part of it, in an institution like a university, it's very hard to get real changes to take place unless people really buy into them. So that's the reason we took that approach. So many of the other studies don't really deal with key issues. We spent a lot of time focusing on issues and how you go about trying to resolve issues. That's not all from the strategic planning; there's a mix in here. A lot of it comes from the concept of change--change theory--which, again, is a big part of my background. So a lot more of the stuff coming out of change literature was in this than you might have in some strategic planning studies.

One informant considered that the model that was used basically came from the theory of organizational development. "It isn't a management model as such, nor is it a higher education model. But it's a planned change model that comes out of the organizational development theory, and that's a field in and of itself, and it's linked to behavioral science. . . . I think it [strategic planning] was just a nice-sounding word. I don't think he had any real big deal about it."

The other Coordinator pointed out that the change from "Planning Study" to "Strategic Planning Project" really did not mean a lot. "It didn't change any of the things that we were going to do or anything; it was just putting a label on it that was more consistent with the recent literature."

One informant interviewed summed up the attitude of the key people who were responsible for this Strategic Planning Project,

. . . so perhaps in descending order, Bob [the Dean] is perhaps most committed to strategic planning as a concept, and Ernie [Coordinator] sees it as a popular term that'll cover what he wants to do, and Joan [Coordinator] has a vision of what should come out of this in terms of what the Faculty should be doing, and whether or not that fits within the school's use of the terminology didn't bother her.

Faculty members interviewed reflected differently upon the title of Strategic Planning Project. One informant felt strongly,

I never really thought the word "strategic" was appropriate. I never really thought this had much to do with strategy. I've been mentioning the word "community," and I was always thinking about it in that way, that this is an indigenous community process, not a strategy to develop some procedures to win a game or something. But as far as I was concerned, this whole thing was a way of attempting to create some consensus. But if you try to just create consensus, what's the winning business to do with this? It seems to me it just wants to get people to understand each other, which is to have a community. So I never did know why this word "strategic" was in here, so I just figured it was some kind of word that . . . people involved in how do you get something done would think about it. . . . If it is strategic, then it's time bound, because it's movement in time and space, and that's important to how you move in the space and in time together. Otherwise the strategy cannot be expressed. But if it's community, then time is nothing. Time becomes an irrelevant parameter.

Another put it bluntly, "I think because it's in the literature . . . it's a catchword. It's merely a planning project. Calling it 'strategic' is in vogue, a current buzzword in the management literature and to some extent in the education literature."

One faculty member expressed his concern,

I'm not sure we can really tell that until we get done with the process that we're going through called "strategic planning" to know when we get to where we're going, we'll know which track we travelled. So in my mind, and it's easy to look at the review as something we look over our shoulders at; we look back. When we make a strategic plan, we try to look ahead, and we look at things that are out here in our peripheral vision--the environment, stakeholder groups, other things like that--and we try to take those things into consideration, plus our past, where we've been, as we move ahead. But when we're doing a review, we literally turn around and walk backward, and that's what the Report produced: the history of the Faculty, *the Dynamics of Diversity*, and so on of the Faculty of Education. But we were trying to do some strategic planning, and we, therefore, should probably have spent less time looking back and more time looking forward.

This section concludes the development of the design of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. The following section describes the organizational structure for carrying out this Project.

The Structure of the Project

The Overall Structure

As indicated earlier, the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was initiated by the Dean. Under the direction of the Dean, it had been carried out by the Project Team which included two Coordinators. Under the Project Team, sub-projects, various committees, task forces, and study teams were set up successively to fulfill the respective tasks in the process of the Project. The Dean described the structure of the Project as follows:

We had the Dean at the top. Then there would be the steering committee or the group that included Dr. Ingram and Dr. Worth [Project Team Coordinators], they were the ones that were responsible for actually developing the proposal, I gave the approval to the plan that they had developed. And then, they set up the structure depending upon which part of the project we are talking about it. The first phase was the information gathering stage and Dr. McIntosh played an important part in that. That's when they had some of these interviewers involved.

Then, there was the issues identification stage, where, among other things, they identified what they called a kind of blue ribbon committee [Issues Identification Panel] where we invited other deans from the University, the ATA Executive Secretary, the Vice-President [Academic] of the University, we had two outside deans, one who has become the President of Mount Saint Vincent University and another who has become the Deputy Minister of Ontario Education, and there were three Faculty members who were selected to this and myself. Dr. Worth, Dr. Ingram [Coordinators] and we met for a couple of days to go over all of the input we received from these different sources. And it was that committee that identified four major issues or themes to be studied.

And then, the next stage was the choosing of the Task Force and Study Team members that was done again with myself, Dr. Ingram, Dr. Worth, identifying and selecting these people and then those Task Forces, of course, had about a year to conduct their study and do their reporting. So it's always been with the idea that the Dean would be the person responsible for it, but the steering committee would conduct most of the work and organization of it and then try to draw as many of the faculty members in the various activities as possible. So, just on the number who served as interviewers and the number who had served as Task Force committee members we probably had almost half of the Faculty involved in those two roles.

Each time when the new groups were identified, the Dean and the Project Coordinators met with them and tried to explain the Project and told them what results would be expected.

"We hadn't told them the ideas that they had to come up with, but we told them how we wanted those reports to eventually fit into the planning of the Faculty. . . so those people I think had been very well instructed," explained the Dean.

In connection with selecting people to work on the Project, one Coordinator explained,

Initially, when he [the Dean] started, he announced that we were going to do the study with three or four purposes that he had thought of, and that he had asked myself and Jean Worth [Coordinator] to head it up. So that was announced in a little memo from the Dean that went to everybody, and it was also announced at a Faculty Council meeting.

And the rest of the people were chosen by the Coordinators in close consultation with the Dean. "I think the basic choices were made by the Project Coordinators. The Dean got the final say on it," noted one informant.

As for the formal decision-making and reporting mechanism of the Project, one Coordinator indicated,

. . . it was fairly short and simple. It just was from the Project Team to the Dean for decision making. The key decision was that they went with the Project and we came up with what we thought of as a project budget, what it would cost, so that was, financial-wise, what we'd come up with and then he had to make the decision whether he could put that much money in, etc. But the only key decision was when we came to him with the design of what we wanted to do and he approved it. After that, then, the Project Team was on its own decision-wise. We moved and did the things we wanted to do, if it fell within the project design. . . So that was only just from us to the Dean. Now, within the project, we had all sorts of people doing things. Once we asked them and gave them the terms of reference, then they reported to us as a Project Team.

One informant who worked as one of the Task Forces leaders reflected upon the statement mentioned above,

I remember this was the process established by the Dean. It wasn't established by the Faculty of Education. It's very interesting. It's purely the Dean's decision. For a long time, I thought we were reporting to the Faculty of Education Council, and I kept reminding myself as having to present this report to the Faculty of Education Council. Then it was down a little bit. The Faculty of Education Council didn't create this process, the Dean created it. So we were reporting to the Project leaders and the Dean.

The Role of the Dean

In the eyes of one faculty member, "the Planning Project is strictly a vehicle for the Dean to implement the ideas he has in mind that he hasn't rationalized openly himself." He further noted that "I examined the data and activities over the last few years. I believe he has a plan as how he wants to mould this faculty and I believe he should put those cards on the table, so that they can be more openly discussed."

However, the Dean denied this, "I said earlier, there are some people in the Faculty who think that I introduced it simply to impose a plan that I already had in mind and that wasn't my intention." He further explained,

My intention was to get them as a faculty making these kinds of decisions, trying to show to them that I was open to their input, their discussion, their decision making. So, once I put the committee in place, I said to them, "Go, do your work." . . . Up until this point, I haven't had any more influence in some of those things than any of the committee members. Although they were coming in and gave me a report and I did agree with, I'd have been just as obliged to take that and discuss with the Faculty.

One informant interviewed agreed with the Dean by saying,

I don't think that he had a firm set of conclusions that he was manipulating people to reach and he was just using this whole process as a smoke screen, but I think he had a number of concerns, a number of things that he thought needed to be reexamined and decisions that needed to be made, and he probably has his preferred positions on some of those issues of the Faculty.

The Dean tried to clarify this,

What I am trying to get across is the belief that I can provide some kind of leadership. It's a tricky kind of issue because on the one hand, you want people in an organization to feel that they have helped to shape the structure, their own working environment, and their own priorities. So you've got to allow these grassroots development; at the same time, in the organization, leaders have to be there to help shape and influence direction, because we are in the leadership position, are privileged to know things about budget, about resources, about other kinds of influences that help some decisions to be more favorable and positive than others.

So we've really got these two things working at the same time, the bottom-up influence and the top-down. And I am trying to keep those in balance, in harmony rather than to let one or the other dominate. And in doing that, it's certainly not an easy thing, because if I become too heavy handed, if I become too authoritarian, then people are going to say, "that Dean is just trying to impose something on us," and even if I managed to get that endorsed officially, people won't really change their behavior. What I am

wanting is if you want to get people to change their behavior, their feeling, then, you've got to let them think that somehow they have contributed to and shaped their own future.

Many faculty members interviewed gave the Dean credit for being "highly supportive of the involvement of the faculty members and of all the activities of the process"; "My feeling is he has communicated with Ernie [Project Coordinator] at every stage on it. He has certainly commented on every stage on it in written form. He has been heavily involved in terms of giving it creditability and that sort of thing," said one faculty member. One Coordinator addressed this issue,

In some cases the Dean gave his blessing on all of this. Now, the Dean never did interfere with any of these things at all. Once the study was set up, we kept him informed, told him what we were doing, and he would often give some ideas, etc. We'd often talked over with him, because he knows the staff members and others well, we'd asked him about possible names, but that was in the same way as we'd asked many other people the same thing. So none of these decisions were the Dean's, they were our Project Team. But we did at times have the Dean to act as front man in many cases. What we'd have the Dean to do is to write the letter and indicate that we're doing this study and indicate that the Project Team is handling it, but he certainly supports us and would be pleased if they could participate. We often did that, so whoever we asked knew that this had the support of the Dean. But the Dean was not part of the decision making machinery as far as what went on in the Project.

One informant commented on Dean's role played in the process of the Project,

I think the Dean took a very specific role in this process. I think he deliberately gave the Project people an opportunity to lead this Project in the way that they saw fit. The Dean did not intervene, the Dean did not exercise influence. He initiated the process, and he approved the original project proposal and then he deliberately stood back from the planning process and let the planning process proceed.

Another interviewee agreed with this point, "It appeared that the Dean set the things up, encouraged it to take place, but tried to stay distant from it." He further commented, "he might have done that because of political concerns within the Faculty, but I think that distancing was too far."

However, some informants perceived that the Dean did not try to sell the ideas of strategic planning to the Faculty members. As one informant commented,

I think that our Dean is not a super salesman. He's a researcher, he's a philosopher, he's an historian, but he's not a salesman. And I think he

could have worked harder on selling the idea and the importance of the idea and what could come out of it for the Faculty, and I think he would have got stronger support. But that's just not his personality; it's just not his style. He wants you to believe in it for academic purposes, very intellectual kind of purposes, as opposed to relating to it from an emotional point of view, a feeling point of view. . . .

Therefore, the Dean played a symbolic leadership role, was a front for the Coordinators, and was removed from the decision making process of the Planning Study.

The Role of the Project Coordinator

One faculty member who prepared the original proposal for the Faculty Self Study recalled the selection of the Project Coordinators,

Actually the leadership was two people . . . the Dean was very interested in having widespread involvement of faculty members in different ways. So, Dr. Ingram [Coordinator] for many years has been committed to these ideas that the planning process should involve a wide range of people. So Ingram was an obvious person to be a member of the Project Team to carry out the planning. . . . and Dr. J. Worth [Coordinator] was approached and asked to be one of the members . . . because Joan Worth was a senior member of the Faculty and very highly respected and a very good organizer.

As one Coordinator recounted,

He [the Dean] called me in to talk to me, and he asked me if I would be interested in being a part of this. Why would he ask me, rather than anybody else in the Faculty? One reason is, I'm a woman. They wanted a female. Bob Patterson [the Dean] is, I've since discovered, very concerned about that aspect, getting women involved. But I don't think that was the only reason. I think it goes back to what I said before: I have a history of involvement in the Faculty with more than just my little piece of elementary education. I've had a lot of experience with programs that involve all of the Faculty, and I'd like to think that was the main reason.

Further, she described briefly about how they started their work as Coordinators.

The commitment that I made was two years half time devoted to the project. And I was very nervous about doing it. I really wasn't sure that I would be able to do it. I didn't know anything about, in quotation marks, "strategic planning." . . . so the initial preparation was, Ernie and I met two or three times I think in the spring, 1986, and then in September of 1986, we started in earnest. We met twice a week every Tuesday and Thursday morning for somewhere between two and three hours, and we talked a lot, just explored ideas. First of all, Ernie had to educate me about what a planning project was, that's his area of expertise, and so he outlined for me what he believed a strategic planning project was, and we had a lot of discussions, and we had a lot of arguments--not arguments, a lot of even disagreements. But we also had a lot of discussions about things and about the way we could adapt

a planning model to the Faculty, because one of the other things I brought to the two of us was a fair knowledge of the Faculty. . . . the first thing we had to do, was just to get the plan clear in our heads, and then we had to work on planning this. That's how we started in that September meeting about six hours a week, and then we did a lot of reading. I had to do a lot of reading on strategic planning.

The other Project Coordinator added, that after they had designed the Strategic Planning Project, they issued a series of newsletters that were to keep the Faculty members and the stakeholder groups informed about what was going on with the Project. And also, "we talked to the Dean probably each month. We had a meeting with the Dean where we just kept him informed about what was going on. And also we'd ask him at times, his advice or information on various facts. We did have regular or semi-regular meetings with him."

One staff member who was heavily involved in the process of the Project felt strongly that, the two coordinators were very aware of that

the whole strategic planning process wouldn't work if it was seen to come only from the Dean's office or from the Dean and the two Coordinators; if it was only a good idea which was concentrated among a few selected people. It was very important for other people in the Faculty to also see it as important.

She believed the two Coordinators were very honest in not pushing the strategic planning process in their own direction. "I don't think they themselves prejudged the direction that the plan would eventually go. I found them very ethical and just unwilling to try to shove their ideas down anybody's throat. They really wanted to hear what other people wanted to say."

The Role of the Department Chairs

Since the department chairs could be considered to be line managers under the Dean's leadership, the Strategic Planning Project needed strong support from them. In response to the role of the department chair in the process of the Strategic Planning Project, one chair recollected, that about six months before the Project started, the Dean informed the chairs that he was planning to carry on this Project. "He asked us if that is all right, what we thought about it. We said 'yes'."

One Coordinator indicated the influence of the department chairs upon the Project,

When we started to discuss some of these things, and those department chairs gave their opinions just like the Dean when he gave his opinions. People would attempt to put a greater degree of confidence in some of those observations than they would from the next door neighbor. As far as other faculty members, we couldn't take away the kind of influence that the Dean or department chairs had because they occupied these positions. . . . We did involve the department chairs. We did a lot of asking them about different things and types of people and to get their commitment to various things. But we wanted this to be more broadly based. . . . The chairs were interviewed a lot more than the others, but we did not bring them front and center. One of the reasons was that when we were looking at structure, a possible structure, we did away with all departments. We didn't want the present structure to have a heavy role to play in what might eventually come out of it, so we didn't want to emphasize our present structures at all.

In the eyes of an informant,

The department chairs had a relatively minor role. They didn't have much of a different role than any of the staff members. I knew they were consulted by Ernie and Joan [Coordinators] about whether or not certain people had time to work on some of the things. It appeared that one of the principles that had been observed was to have planning not going through the formal structures, the formal channels wherein you had certain engaged people like the department chairman and so on and to have more of the Faculty activities that involved members of the Faculty as members of the Faculty, not necessarily through the departments and through the department chairman; sort of having it something that transcended the normal structures and normal lines of communications through those structures. I think that was the basic principle to avoid of being tied with the university administration, with the Dean and the department chairmen.

One department chair felt strongly that "there was no role established for chairman that would be any different from that established for any members of the Faculty." As one informant observed,

I didn't see that the chairmen had any role in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. They might have, but I was not aware of that. They sat on the Dean's Advisory Committee which was a powerful group, powerful administrative group, I knew very little about what that committee did, but I've never heard of anything which came out of that even acknowledged this process was supported by them.

One interviewee explained the reason why the Project did not involve the department chairs heavily. He noted,

My own feeling is that the department chairs did not play an important part . . . some of the department chairmen did very shrewd and careful analyses of the state of the Faculty. Others, I thought that their major preoccupation

was with their departments and that they didn't have a good overview of problems and concerns in the Faculty as a whole. They were preoccupied with departmental concerns rather than Faculty concerns . . . few of the department chairmen really have a sense of Faculty-wide issues, they may have had a good sense on departmental issues, but they have no sense, not a good sense at all of faculty issues. And I took this as indication of really a lack of concern or interest in the Faculty Strategic Planning Study. I had a sense that they were no more, as a group, they were no more interested in the Strategic Planning Study than the average faculty member.

He was asked whether the department chairs might consider themselves as line managers of the Faculty, and he commented,

I bet if you talk to the department chairs, they would not refer to themselves as line managers. I think of a university as not being an organization that is organized on the line/staff principle at all. I see it more as being a feudal realm in which the Dean is like the King, and not a very strong King who is surrounded by feudal lords, each of whom is very strong, and those are the department chairs. So that, rather than a line/staff organization structure, I see six feudal warlords, going to the Chinese history, each of them was very strong in their own regions with the relatively weak central government, and the weak central government dependent upon the favour of the feudal warlords. That's my model of organization in the Faculty, so that the Dean, I don't think the Dean exercises a kind of influence over department chairmen that a line administrator typically exercises over the people on the next rung of the ladder. They have a certain degree of autonomy from the Dean, and they may or may not cooperate or support the Dean. And I know some department chairmen saw their primary role as representing the interests of their department rather than supporting the Dean in his Faculty-wide leadership.

The other informant observed,

the department chair knows the particular problems, developments, and directions that are going on in the areas, the subject content areas of their particular department. I think the overall goal of this planning was to integrate the Faculty. I think that in the mind of some of our administrators, [they] would like to see a non-departmentalized faculty. Now, surely, if you want a non-departmental faculty, you don't put on the committee representatives from the departments.

In general, the reflections on the structure of the Strategic Planning Project were different. Some thought "the structure for the Project is an acceptable structure. But there are many ways of going." One faculty member felt that the structure "was given independence from the Dean's office, because one of the areas they were looking at was the governance of the organization, the administrative structure" and he thought the two Coordinators that the Dean picked "have the strength to remain independent of many

pressure groups." However, one faculty member did not agree with this and he expressed his concerns,

I didn't worry about its independence from the Dean's Office, but I worried about its intellectual independence, because I believe that the two people running it are not free-thinkers in the sense that it [the study] would not work. But it strikes me that maybe this is inevitable in any faculty, that you don't get arm's length analysis when you do internal versus external evaluation, or internal versus external analysis. I'm not saying they should have brought in a consultant from outside who would head it up, but I think, from where I stood, the products of the process, that is, the various reports that came out, the turn, the change in direction I spoke of between the results of the interview study and the next stage, suggest to me that the price was paid, we paid a price for having internal monitors who were basically obsequious towards the Dean's Office, not that the Dean demanded it, but that you don't get independent thinking when you get a couple of educators looking at what they have invested a lot of their time and energy in. They've been both here for a very long time, a lot of commitment to some of the things so already there is not enough of a critical perspective. That's a critique of the organizational structure in the sense that independence wasn't guaranteed.

One informant pointed out that in the structure, "one of the things that we have to recognize is that there's some pretty good friendships here. . . . Some of this is a product of personality and of people who know one another, which over the years has been a very good thing."

One interviewee expressed about his feelings strongly, "I am not a great believer of committees. I am always skeptical when committees are set up especially when they are large committees." He further commented,

It depends who you put on the committee. Committees can be stacked, you can put on the committee the people that will bring about what you want. So my first concern always is who is on the committee, what kind of directions have been given? What are their own bias? To what extent do they acquiesce to authority, to what extent do they owe their allegiance to their discipline or do they owe to their superior?

One informant thought the structure was complex, such as the number of structures, superstructures, substructures, sub-committees, task forces, Issue Identification Panels and study teams. "When something gets going like that, and you keep reading about them. The faculty members have got their everyday life to do, they've got their classes to prepare, they've got their essays to mark, their graduate students to examine. They don't really

have time for all this complicated stuff." One faculty member perceived that the structure did not bring the goals and intentions of the Project close enough to the center of people's consciousness.

Communication with Faculty

As mentioned earlier, the Dean used the Faculty of Education Council (FEC) to acquaint the faculty members with the process of the Strategic Planning Project and addressed its significance. On the other hand, the Project Team set up a newsletter to communicate with faculty members and stakeholder groups. According to one Coordinator:

After we had designed it and indicated what we were going to do, we had a series of newsletters that went out all the time, but the first public announcement and discussion of it was at a Faculty Council meeting when we attended and went into detail about what we were going to do and how we were going to do it. At the Faculty Council meeting, there were also the representatives of stakeholder groups, the ATA's represented, these other faculties were represented, etc. So they got the announcement that way. But we also sent sort of newsletters or information sheets to the stakeholder groups, so they knew what was going on. . . . the Dean did announce it two or three times and then we kept the faculty [informed], by reporting what we were doing at the Faculty Council and through newsletters.

One informant commented on the newsletter, "I think it's crucial to have a newsletter. I think that the newsletters were good, they were short, they reported on the most important points, and people were informed regularly, and they knew what was going on, they knew the process." Another added by saying,

I think, expanding the idea, a strategic planning newsletter kept people informed about the process, provided a vehicle for the Dean to communicate with people about his perspective of the process, provided a vehicle for the Coordinators and other people who were involved with the process to communicate. So I really think that a newsletter is one of the vehicles that might have been used to strengthen that communication.

Altogether seven newsletters were issued within a four-year period. Some faculty members thought they were "enough" and "effective," "easy to read and understand," and "did a good job in communication." However, in contrast to these perceptions, some

faculty members thought that the newsletters were not frequent enough. One thought the newsletter should be written once a month for maybe eight months out of the year but not in the summer, or maybe to write it every other month. Just make it regular, rather than "We'll put out a newsletter when we feel like it." That would have helped people increase their participation and heighten their involvement.

Summary

In this chapter, the background information regarding the reasons of the establishment of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, its design, and structure, is presented. The next chapter describes the procedures and approaches employed in the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, the outcomes resulted from the process and the nature of the involvement of the participants in the process of the Project.

CHAPTER V

PROCEDURES, INVOLVEMENTS, AND OUTCOMES

Introduction

As described earlier, the major procedures of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project were designed in four phases: 1) Internal Review and Environmental Examination, 2) Issues Identification, 3) Generation of Alternatives for Issues Resolution, and 4) Development of an Action Plan. Each of these four major phases was included with its own approaches and set of procedures. This chapter focuses upon the procedures of the four phases and describes the outcomes resulted from the process.

Phase 1: Internal Review and Environmental Examination

According to Ingram (1987), the first objective of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Study was to identify and describe the trends and current status of the Faculty in respect to its mission, organization, services, interrelationships, policies, and programs. In order to achieve this objective, in June of 1986, the Project set up two studies: one was *The Current Status and Trends Study*, which was designed to inform Faculty members and stakeholder groups about the Faculty and stimulate them to consider issues facing the Faculty; and the other, *A Review of the Literature on Issues in Teacher Education*, which was designed as an information source for those involved in identifying issues faced by the Faculty and for those considering alternative approaches to issue resolution. Therefore, the internal review of the Faculty and the examination of the external conditions of the Faculty were carried out by these two studies. The following section discusses the details of the two studies.

Studying Current Status and Trends

One of the Project Coordinators explained the purpose of conducting *The Current Status and Trends Study*:

When you start on any strategic plan, you have to start from a knowledge base. You have to know where you're coming from, so this was the knowledge base, this was the data base. Because it's a big faculty and most of the people in the Faculty are very department bound, so they don't know what goes on in other departments or, in many cases, they only know their own tiny little piece of the undergraduate teacher education program. They don't have the big picture, so that was part of the purpose of that.

After this Study was initiated, the two Coordinators assigned it to a senior faculty member in June of 1986. As one Coordinator indicated there were several reasons to select this faculty member to conduct this Study.

One thing he had had the experience. He had been an Assistant Dean and an Associate Dean. He had also had experience before and worked for the Human Resources Research Council, which was a different type of organization looking at different things, so he had this wide background and wide experience, and he knew this Faculty and he knew most of its members by working in it. And also, because his expertise was very good. He had worked with me and with others on many other studies and had showed his expertise in digging out and getting out and analyzing and interpreting this kind of information. So it was on that basis: he seemed to have the expertise and background to do that.

The faculty member in charge of the study explained that the principal intent of this Study was to describe the Faculty, but not to analyze the Faculty, "it was intended to be descriptive, to describe the current status of the Faculty and to give some insight into problem areas, or areas where there were issues to be resolved. Our task was very clear that our job was largely descriptive, we could point out the direction of issues, but we weren't to actually identify issues."

In conducting this Study, questions in five general areas were designed to serve as guidelines for collecting data:

- As a Faculty, what purposes do we address? What programs do we offer?
- What are some of key characteristics of the students who come to us?
- What resources -- human, financial, and material -- do we apply to these various purposes and programs?
- How do we organize to carry out our work?

- What is the nature of the Faculty's relationships with external units and organizations?
- As a Faculty, what is the nature of our achievements? (McIntosh, 1987, p. 9)

Starting from July of 1986, the study team of *The Current Status and Trends Study* began to collect data through (1) interviewing people external and internal to the Faculty of Education, (2) reviewing the available University and Faculty reports, documents, and records, and (3) surveying the operations of selected faculties of education in Canada and in the United States. The first thing was to select interviewees. In terms of choosing interviewees, one Coordinator said,

Ernie [Coordinator] and I just talked about them. Ernie had a broad background with the Alberta Teachers' Association and with Alberta Education, so the two of us just decided who we thought the major stakeholder agencies were. We would ask people, we would ask the Dean, sometimes we would ask the other Dr. Worth [Former Dean and Deputy Minister of Education of Alberta]: "Who do you think are people that should be interviewed?"

The professor in charge of the *Current Status and Trends Study* recollected,

I carried on interviewing about 30 people and those interviews were largely inside the Faculty, key spokesmen within the Faculty [Dean's Office, department chairs, and support units of the Faculty of Education] and about half of them were outside the Faculty. So I interviewed senior administrative officers, academic administrative officers within the University, like the Dean of Arts, the Dean of Sciences, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Vice-President [Academic] of the University. I interviewed people, key people outside the University, like the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education, the Deputy Minister of Education, the Executive Secretary of the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Executive Secretary of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, and so on. So I was encouraged to interview a wide range of people who were leaders of the stakeholder groups. I think the Dean was very anxious that the stakeholders were very much part of the planning process.

Interviews with people outside the Faculty were carried out using a three-question-interview-guide which included (a) issues facing the Faculty, (b) the Faculty's relationships with stakeholder groups, and (c) advice for "the next decade and beyond". An eight-question interview guide was used to interview people within the Faculty. It included questions on the Faculty's issues, mission, programs, organization and procedures, resources, organizational health, and relationships within the Faculty.

One informant from a stakeholder group indicated that the information that *The Current Status and Trends Study* attempted to seek was

basically advice with respect to what they were proceeding to do, and they wanted confirmation or at least some support in the sense that we thought they were doing the right thing. It was basically seeking advice and co-operation in the planning process, and advice with respect to the procedures that they were putting into place. And the target was basically to revitalize or vitalize, energize the Faculty of Education to look at improving the quality of teacher education and insuring that it was able to prepare teachers who could function effectively in the twenty-first century.

By the end of 1986, approximately twenty-eight interviews were completed and the interview data analyzed. Data collection from the University and Faculty documents and from the survey of the operations of the selected faculties of education in Canada and in the United States were also completed. The professor in charge was starting to draft the Report entitled *The Dynamics of Diversity*, which was bringing all the data together, reporting on the interview and literature data, describing the history of the Faculty and how the Faculty organization functioned in comparison with other faculties of education. As one informant who was involved in editing the Report mentioned,

The most difficult part of *The Dynamics of Diversity* was that specifically, we weren't supposed to draw any conclusions. The purpose for this *Dynamics of Diversity* was to provide a kind of background of current situations and status of the Faculty in order to move to issue identification forums after everyone had read it. So it was a big job of gathering all this information together without drawing any conclusions, because the thing we were told not to do by the Dean, particularly, by Ernie and Joan, who were the Coordinators--we were told not to pre-judge.

In connection with the format of the Report, McIntosh (1987) pointed out,

We have chosen to use a two-column page format. The wide column of text is used to describe the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta. In the narrower column which forms the outside margin of each page, we present brief excerpts and quotations from the current research literature on teacher education, from Canada and international reports on new directions, proposed for teacher education specifically and faculties of education in general, and from material provided by selected faculties of education about their current activities. In selecting this format, our intention has been to place the Faculty in a national and international context and to suggest aspects of Faculty operations which may be similar to or, in a few instances, different from our sister institutions in other locales. (p. 11)

In February of 1987, the Report of the Current Status and Trends Study: *The Dynamics of Diversity* was published and distributed to all the faculty members and stakeholder groups. Most of the informants interviewed believed that this was an excellent self-study report. People were interested in it, because it presented for the first time a snapshot picture of the Faculty of Education. One commented, "I thought it was an excellent document providing a snapshot of historical perspective on where the Faculty of Education is now." Another noted, "I did find it was a useful document which acted as catalyst for my thinking about what issues I would want to raise." The other considered that "*The Dynamics of Diversity* document gave us a wealth of information about what people thought of this Faculty." One interviewee noted, "*The Dynamics of Diversity* provided a tremendous amount of information about the Faculty and sources for people to understand this Faculty." One informant from a stakeholder group believed that the Report

has made them [the Faculty] aware of what the external demands are, has made them aware of their limitations and strengths internally, has made them aware of the fiscal constraints that are upon them, and it has really said, "Okay, knowing all that, how do we create a Faculty of Education, which is second to be done? And that's the object: Make it the best that we possibly can."

One informant indicated the description of the Report was fairly accurate, but "it didn't do much about identification of possible problems, that it was almost a public relations document, that it wasn't a tool or an instrument of analysis." Another thought "it raised some of the issues which I would consider to be important like resource allocation, funding, department organization, faculty organization, but I don't know it had very much impact on the final report."

Nevertheless, three themes emerged as relevant to many of the aspects of the Faculty operations from the Report: *The Dynamics of Diversity*. McIntosh (1987) described them as:

- 1) A Matter of Balance. The Faculty of Education is a complex organization which engages in a wide range of activities and responds to the diverse and legitimate claims of a number of interested parties: undergraduate and graduate students, the University and scholarly

community, the profession, school systems, and provincial government. Are all the activities of the faculty in optimal balance? Is the Faculty responding to the diverse claims placed upon it in the best way of which it is capable?

- 2) The Web of Relationships. The Faculty is at the centre of a web of sometimes conflicting relationships. If its activities are not in optimal balance, it may not be an easy matter to find a better balance point because its partners in the web of relationships are, at times, pulling in different directions. It is likely that the purposes and programs of the Faculty of Education, more than those of any other faculty in this University, are subject to the tensions resulting from conflicting expectations.
- 3) A Question of Quality. Should the Faculty do less, in a quantitative sense, in order to do work of higher quality? At the same time, can the Faculty do this higher quality work with declining financial resources? Can the Faculty maintain and increase quality while responding appropriately to changing conditions and demands? (pp. 10-11)

In sum, the Report on *The Current Status and Trends Study* described the major characteristics and strengths of the Faculty and examined the conditions and environments which were influencing the change and renewal of the Faculty.

Reviewing Literature on Issues in Teacher Education

While *The Current Status and Trends Study* had been undertaken, the other study, *A Review of the Literature on Issues in Teacher Education* was also in progress. As one Project Coordinator recalled,

... in commissioning the other study on teacher education, we selected Nykolay Hrynyk, because this had been his area of concern for many years. He had just retired as Associate Executive Secretary of the Alberta Teachers' Association and he had the time. So, it's the time and expertise in both that we had him to do that.

Dr. Hrynyk conceded, in retrospect,

It must have been in the spring of 1986. Dr. Ingram [Coordinator] approached me, partly, I suspect, because I was available, I was cheap. There wasn't a lot of budget assigned to this, and since I was retired and on a pension, I didn't quite need as much financial support as some other people would have needed, and, of course, I had the full time to devote to it.

Another reason, Dr. Hrynyk mentioned, was that he had a considerable interest and experience since he had been associated with the Alberta Teachers' Association's teacher

education program for many years and had served on the Faculty of Education Council at Alberta, Calgary, and Lethbridge on a number of occasions for a number of years.

Before Dr. Hrynyk started to work for this Study, he had conversations with the Project Coordinators. According to his recollection, what they wanted him to do was to review the literature indicating trends, new ideas, pressures on teacher education, and developments in teacher education in other jurisdictions.

They suggested that I build on any literature that was associated with the development in the United States, the Teacher Education Review, first with *A Nation at Risk*, and then there were a couple of others that came out of that. I recalled also that they particularly wanted to find out the Canadian studies that were underway.

He was also told that this study

was going to serve the committee setup and then the study group setup that was going to develop in this whole process . . . So this serving was that it would identify the trends and events in other places, it would identify the sources of information for other parts of the English-speaking world, therefore, save considerable time for the people who were going to form these various study groups within the departments and program areas. . . . So one of the purposes was to provide the Faculty with information which gave them that kind of demographic background of the challenge that would be facing the Faculty in the next number of years . . . the other purpose of the literature review was serving as the background for consideration that people or committees which were involved in the Strategic Planning process would use the information as a source to assist them in identifying issues that faced the Faculty into the future.

Additionally, Dr. Hrynyk mentioned,

When I first started I had a conversation with Dr. Patterson [the Dean] and checked with him on the expectations of this. . . . I didn't think that they simply wanted a whole series of abstracts about material on this subject. They wanted, in some way, a compilation and a condensation, which would provide guidance for other people to look where they might go and to provide stimulation for other people as part of an environmental scanning. So I was double checking with Dr. Patterson how that might work. I think it's probably a little different than standard reviews of the literature, because one of the things was that they were not interested in my opinion and my interpretation and my analysis and synthesis. . . .

Dr. Hrynyk did all of the basic work by himself. The librarian in the Faculty of Education Library did an ERIC search and other library searches on key words and for information and materials he identified. The librarian at the Alberta Teachers' Association

Library did a thorough review of the publications and information available there. And the Coordinators provided some basic beginning materials. The Canadian Teachers' Federation Library provided most of the materials related to Britain and materials related to reports, mainly unpublished materials from Ontario. Dr. Hrynyk also contacted the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the Association of Teacher Educators in Britain for collecting related materials. The literature review had been completed by the end of January of 1987. In February of 1987, the Report, *Issues in Teacher Education: A Review of the Literature*, was published and distributed.

Generally speaking, this literature review focussed on a faculty of education environment, taking into account external factors such as the demands of society, the politics of education, the impact of technology, demographics, employment of faculty graduates, and expectations to be met in the K-12 system. In terms of internal-external factors such matters as relationships with other faculties in the university, relationships with other agencies in the educational system, the demands of the profession and control of decision-making were included. Among internal aspects were those which operated within a faculty of education. They included such things as faculty and individual autonomy, faculty mission, departmentalization, faculty resources, and faculty evaluation. The Review also dealt with programs in faculties of education under such subdivisions as time, involvement of other faculties, practicum experiences, theory-practice bridge, inservice education, impact of research, and nature of teacher education curriculum. Finally, this Review summarized a few general statements on teacher education reform, described several recent American reports on the subject and referred to some Canadian studies and literature (Hrynyk, 1987, p. 1).

Although most informants did not mention this literature review Report during the researcher's interview period, there were some who were very interested in it and found it "was thoroughly done and very useful." One informant felt strongly that "you wouldn't dream of tackling a strategic planning project without doing a review of the literature." It

would make sure that "you're not duplicating, that you're not repeating history. At least you will have known that others have tried this way and may have learned something and you may be able to build on the experience of others rather than just repeat it." Another informant considered that the Report indicated the background information to task forces and study teams and they should apply this information as a basic clue and use the Report to expand their own special interest and apply it to the subjects that they were considering.

As described above, the first phase of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project--the Internal Review and Environmental Examination--had been completed. The major Report of *The Current Status and Trends Study: The Dynamics of Diversity*, was distributed in February, 1987, to all Faculty members, as well as to representatives of stakeholder groups. Meanwhile, the other Report growing out of the first phase, *Issues in Teacher Education: A Review of the Literature*, was also distributed in February, 1987. As scheduled, individual interviews with all Faculty members and representatives of stakeholder groups were going to be conducted in order to obtain reactions to the Report of *The Current Status and Trends Study* and to identify the concerns and issues they believed faced the Faculty presently and in the years ahead. The following section deals with this process.

Phase 2: Issue Identification

In the Document, *Issue Identification Procedures: Orientation to Panel Members*, "issues", for the purposes of this Project, were defined as those problems, or sets of problems, and conditions which had the potential for influencing the future development and operation of the Faculty (Ingram & Worth, 1986, p. 1). The identification of issues was essential for the generation of alternative futures and the charting of directions, as well as for the development of alternative approaches to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Faculty. This section deals with how the reactions and concerns of the Faculty

members and the stakeholder groups on *The Current Status and Trends Study Report* were obtained and the procedures and approaches used to identify issues facing the Faculty.

Gathering Reactions through Interviews

In January of 1987, eighteen interviewers were selected from the faculty members by the Project Team in order to gather reactions and concerns by interviewing the Faculty members. According to one Coordinator, the interviewers were selected on two criteria:

one, we wanted to make sure there was some kinds of representation over the Faculty. . . . We wanted a broad range of people. We also wanted to make sure that the people that we had had a reputation of getting on with people, listing honest kinds of information, and being able to interpret this well.

Then, he continued, "so we got this by talking with different people, by department chairmen, by others that knew people, etc. So keeping these two or three things in mind, then, we just went to the staff lists and got a whole list, and then started asking people."

As one informant, who was chosen as an interviewer, commented, "They were trying to get a cross-section of people from various departments involved with the interviewing process. They were trying to get people that they felt would relate to other people within the Faculty."

Since interviewing Faculty members was an important procedure in the process of the Strategic Planning Project, the Project Coordinators provided an orientation meeting for the interviewers. They told the interviewers about the process that was going to be gone through and the alternative ways of involving people to gain information for identifying issues. They explained to interviewers how what they were doing would fit into the total process of the Project. Still, one of the Project Coordinators doubted how many interviewers really had obtained an overall view of strategic planning and its continuous role in decision making. Therefore, Interview Orientation Seminars were held and one professor, who specialized in research methodology, was invited by the Project Coordinators to train the interviewers. As this professor recalled,

I did that in a couple of seminars and set up a system that would perhaps make it easier for them to do the content analysis and that would standardize somewhat the questions they asked, the nature. So that was a technical level training.

In addition to the Seminars, one informant who used to work as an interviewer recollected,

Basically, we had gone through a process of being trained to talk to them [Faculty members] about some particular things in connection with the directions for the Faculty. The major purpose was to gain some insight in terms of people's perspectives about where the Faculty should be going in relation to certain issues . . . and we had been trained in connection with some general methodology as to how we might do that so that all of the interviews would be relatively consistent in their approach, and we proceeded to document particular points around those issues. All the interviewers were trained basically . . . and we trained ourselves, too, because we learned from each other. We went out and did a little pilot interview, and then we came back together again.

Further, the professor who trained the interviewers summed up by saying,

We had trained two batches of interviewers, with one of them it was great, it went well, they were "good students", and I was able to do what I wanted. In the other one, there was a person who professed to be an expert in interviewing; unfortunately, his expertise lies in counselling psychology. He interfered very seriously that day by giving free advice. He essentially told our colleagues that there was no need to ask direct questions, that "you should let them say what they wanted to say." . . . So I always felt that half of the interviewers went out with the instructions that would serve the purpose of the study, and the other half must have had ambiguous messages.

However, through this Orientation Seminar, the interviewers shared the pilot interview experiences, learned the approaches of interviewing, set up the interview questions, finalized the Report Form, distributed the interviewee list, and got ready to start their work.

At the same time, a letter from the Project Coordinators with regard to the Response to the Report: *The Dynamics of Diversity* was distributed to all the faculty members. The main purpose of this letter was to invite the faculty members to participate in a 30 to 45 minutes interview. The interview data would be used to identify key issues faced by the Faculty as it prepared for the future.

During March and April of 1987, about 149 Faculty members (91 percent of the Faculty members, others were on leave or not available at the time) were interviewed

individually for about one hour each. They were asked by the interviewers to comment on the following aspects:

- 1) The discrepancies between the information in the Report: *The Dynamics of Diversity* and the interviewee's perception on the Faculty;
- 2) Identifying the strength, concerns, and desirable future changes on:
 - a. mission and purposes of the Faculty,
 - b. programs (undergraduate, graduate, research, professional service),
 - c. faculty organization,
 - d. procedures for policy making, planning, decision making, and monitoring,
 - e. relationships between the Faculty and its units,
 - f. relationships between the Faculty and the field,
 - g. relationships between the Faculty and the University, and
 - h. services provided to departments and faculty members; and
- 3) Any matters of significant concerns (Ingram & Worth, 1987b, p. 1).

As one informant who worked as an interviewer described,

I interviewed ten people. As I talked with people, there was really a high degree of interest. I would say, everybody I talked to was interested in the idea in terms of strategic planning. I didn't find anybody that I interviewed that was not interested in it. Their enthusiasm was varied: Some were very enthusiastic; I'd say about a third of the people that I interviewed. A third were okay, "Yes, this is good to do"; and about a third were interested again, but a little skeptical about the process, "What was going to come out of it?"

Another faculty member who worked as an interviewer described the process of conducting interviews and dealing with the interview data,

I basically kept notes on the interview as I was doing it, and then from those notes, I wrote it out in terms of point form. So I had two stages for myself: The first stage was to go in with a fairly clear idea of what we were going to gather in terms of information and to let the person know that that was probably going to take about an hour to an hour and a half, depending on how much discussion we got into. We used basically the same approach with everybody in terms of the questions that we asked around the little formal guidelines that we had. Then from those guidelines we had formed, I just wrote up the things as we talked really quickly.

What I did was basically listen to the action words that people were using and wrote it all down. I would get the verb, the direct object, and the clarifying phrase for what they were saying. So I would end up with a lot of notes, and I would find it would take me usually about two hours to write up each interview. I wrote it up in point form based on the structure we had had, and then just submitted it to Joan Worth and Ernie Ingram [Coordinators], and they passed it on to the research assistant who was working for them. At that point, that person was writing that material up into a synthesized version and saying, "There were ten people that said this, and there were eight people that said this." So he was trying to take the information we provided from those hundred and fifty Faculty members and tried to provide the information in a synthesized form.

By way of doing this, the responses reported by the 18 interviewers were summarized and classified. All responses for each question were classified into categories and examined by the Project Coordinators. The resulting summary analysis was organized on the basis of the topics or questions outlined in the interview guide. For each of the eight major topics in Question 2, the perceived strengths, concerns, and future changes as interpreted and categorized by the Project Team were listed in order of frequency of mention (Ingram & Worth, 1987b, p. 1). However, it was not surprising that what was perceived as a strength by some was often viewed with concern by others. All the major divergences in perceptions were presented. The number of faculty members reported as making no comments for each topic, and the similarity or overlap of comments about various topics, reflected the differing interpretations of the interviewers, the interrelatedness of the topics, as well as the diversity of perspectives, interests, and experience of faculty members. The Project Coordinators deliberately avoided identifying any pervasive themes or generalizations and left them for the Issue Identification Panel and the individual Faculty members to make in the later procedures (Ingram & Worth, 1987b, pp. 1-2).

Many informants expressed their point of view on the process of the interviews. One remarked with satisfaction,

I think the interview one was most successful, because it gave me and each of my colleagues a chance to say what we thought, there was a one-to-one situation, I mean, the person doing interviewing was accepting what we said. And I know in talking to other people around the Faculty, they like the interviews, because it gave them that chance to say "I think that we should do this, and this, this." Nobody did have to defend anything in

front of a large group of people. So they felt in a sense they had their safety. And they weren't intimidated in a situation about what they said.

One informant who worked as an interviewer believed, "the best approach in most of the things that we did is an interview type of approach . . . if you want to get at what people feel and think, the best way to do that is to interview them." Another perceived the interview with faculty members was "very thoroughly done and gave me every opportunity to say whatever was on my mind. . . . They put out a report, and I noticed that some of the things that I had talked about were included in it."

Paradoxically, one informant thought it was an excellent process, because it allowed people to talk with one another as human beings on people's common professional interests,

but I have a significant kind of discomfort by the fact that I see no evidence of my concerns in any of the materials that come out from that. But now, as a person involved in the Faculty I am disappointed, because it seems to me some of the important issues that I've found are important are not being addressed and I think they will be less well off as a result of that.

Another informant agreed with this, "some of the issues that I have raised and other people have raised, but they didn't include those in the report." Surprisingly, one informant put it this way,

I think that was a good step, because it makes people feel they were having inputs. Whether they were really having input or not was another matter because although I guess some of the final report had to be a very polite report saying there're tensions in the Faculty. Nobody really wants to come out and say specifically what they are. I think administrators in the Faculty wouldn't need to go through this expensive time-consuming process if they got off their back side and came down to see what ordinary staff members were doing once in a while.

One faculty member believed that the interviews, in a large way, were intended to identify issues, but he put forward an interesting question "What is an issue and how do you know what you have got from somebody is an issue?" He considered that those kinds of judgements were made by the committee in this process and were not checked or double checked with the faculty support. "Now, they begin the feedback information, I feel that it was useful in a sense of providing some motivations for people to concern themselves with

some of these kinds of questions. I'm not so sure that the processes and procedures were most effective or most likely effective."

However, the Dean commented on the process of the interviews from the administrator's point of view,

We got people to participate in, until we got those 18 people doing the interviewing, they began to feel part of this venture. Also when people have been given a chance through an interview to express their opinion, that's a way of getting them to show some increases to the commitment to the Project.

One faculty member agreed with this point by saying, "For a large number of people in the faculty involved in the process were pretty good at communicating themselves."

Identifying Issues by Panel

After all the Faculty members were interviewed, an Issue Identification Panel was created to translate (1) the concerns and views of Faculty members and stakeholders, (2) Faculty's structure and operations, and (3) knowledge gained from the literature and of the Panel members, into "Issues" (Ingram & Worth, 1987a, p. 4). With regard to selecting Panel members, one Project Coordinator indicated,

We wanted to make sure that we had representation from the key interest groups in Alberta. And so that's why we asked people from the ATA, from Alberta Education, and particularly, we asked the Deputy Minister, and he agreed to sit on it. We asked the Executive Secretary of the ATA, and he agreed to sit on it. Then we also asked at the University itself. We asked the President's Office, and we got a representative there. We also asked to get a good representation, we asked the Dean of Business, and he agreed to sit on it. So, those, internally, within Alberta, were the external people to our own Faculty. And then, we wanted two outside people, outside Alberta, so, we went to N. L. Hersom who was the President of Mount Saint Vincent University. Now, Hersom had always been interested in teacher education. She was a graduate here years before, but had held many posts, as Dean of Education, etc, in different parts of Canada, and was now a university president, so we thought she would be ideal. She knew our situation, she had had all those other experiences. We also asked B. J. Shapiro who had been a Director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and was now, Deputy Minister in Ontario, and we thought that would be a good one. So we wanted to get that wide, broad range of people, in addition to a few faculty members from our own Faculty.

The other Coordinator added,

We tried with the Issues Identification Panel to make that a pretty high-level panel in the sense that you got the Deputy Minister, you got the Secretary-Treasurer of the Alberta Teachers' Association, you got the top level that you can, because they had the confidence to feel that they were representing their agency. If you asked a Grade Two teacher to come in and represent the Alberta Teachers' Association, that Grade Two teacher could represent maybe Grade Two teachers, but maybe not the big ATA.

The Dean also explained briefly that he was trying to choose Panel members from "those organizations which would be most helpful." He wanted to have the professional association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, involved. "He did think it was important that the profession, the practitioners, be consulted with respect to what the Faculty of Education should do. And the Alberta Teachers' Association was the voice of the practitioners," said one informant.

Then, the 12-member-Panel was set up. They were provided with all background reports prepared since the Strategic Planning Project had started, such as, *The Dynamics of Diversity: The Faculty of Education in Context*; *Issues in Teacher Education: A Review of the Literature*; *Report of Interviews with Faculty Members: A Working Paper*; *An Overview of the Strategic Planning Study*; and two published newsletters. On the basis of this information and their own knowledge and experience, each Panel member was asked to identify and elaborate a maximum of five issues faced by the Faculty and submit these to the Project Coordinators before June 10th of 1987. All the Panel members sent their issues statements to the Project Coordinators in due time. These were then collated, categorized, and summarized by the Project Team into the following seven issue areas:

- 1) the nature of teaching and the teaching profession,
- 2) the nature of the "Teacher education" program,
- 3) a professional school within a university community,
- 4) mission and goals of the faculty,
- 5) enrollment management,
- 6) faculty structure, organization, and procedures, and
- 7) relationships with and responsibilities to the field of practice.

These seven issue areas were identified in preparation for further discussions in the upcoming Issue Identification Seminar.

Clarifying Issues through Seminar

During the two-day Issue Identification Seminar on June 18 and 19, 1987, the summary of the seven issue areas mentioned above were presented to the Panel members and were discussed, debated, specified, and elaborated. Meanwhile, the factors which contributed to the issues were identified; the constraints to issue resolution were examined, the priority of the issues was classified; and finally, the general orientations and directions for issue resolution were discussed. Eventually, all the issues were categorized into

- 1) determining and specifying a mission and set of goals which would adequately guide the operations of the Faculty;
- 2) developing and organizing programs and activities to effectively fulfill its mission; and
- 3) establishing and operationalizing a set of structures, relationships, and operational procedures which could best facilitate achievement of its mission and goals.

The sub-questions under the three issue areas were as follows:

- 1) What emerging models or frameworks for organizing teacher preparation programs should be considered for adoption?
- 2) How can the Faculty develop and maintain high standards of student admission and performance?
- 3) What should be the nature and role of field experiences in the teacher education program?
- 4) Who should be responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating the teacher preparation program?
- 5) Should graduate studies within the Faculty be more closely geared to the continuing education needs of educators?

- 6) What constitutes appropriate research and scholarly activity for a professional faculty, and how can these be facilitated?
- 7) How can the Faculty more clearly define and implement its leadership/service role in improving professional practice?
- 8) How can the Faculty clarify its mission and goals, and its priorities, to make them compatible with the expectations held for the Faculty?
- 9) What type of organization will best ensure goal achievement as well as a productive and satisfying work environment for faculty members?
- 10) How can the rewards system--in particular the standards, policies, and procedures of the Faculty Salaries and Promotions Committee (FSPC)--recognize productivity in a professional faculty? and
- 11) How can the operational procedures of the Faculty, in particular the Faculty of Education Council, be made more effective?

All these issues were elaborated and reported in the resulting issues statement--*Issues Facing the Faculty of Education* (Ingram & Worth, 1987a). In reflection upon the Issue Identification Seminar, one informant who was a Panel member indicated,

I think in the process we certainly had the opportunity to make known the issues that we thought were of concern to this Department [Alberta Education] generally, and with respect to teacher education specifically. We had ample opportunity to make those issues known, and they were considered reasonably well. The one issue that was identified was the issue of supply-demand with respect to teacher supply and demand. I'm not sure that the solution was the one that I like. The most disappointing part of the whole solution side of that particular issue was the development of a quota program or establishing of quotas with outputs that match the capabilities of Faculty rather than outputs that match the needs of our environment.

One informant indicated his input on the Issue Identification Seminar,

We looked at the list of issues, and we tried to put them in some sort of priority. I personally took the view, and still take the view, that the research activity of the Faculty is less useful than it might be, because it is too uncoordinated: each professor pursues his own research interests, each graduate student works on something for a project or a thesis, but there's nothing putting these things together. . . . That's one thing I feel I've advocated, supported, argued, in the Issues Identification Seminar, the identification of a research focus. The other thing is the one I've already

mentioned that the ATA in general has been pushing, is we must realize that the main mission of this Faculty is to prepare teachers, and those Faculty members who don't care to be involved in that should find somewhere else to work; they don't really belong here.

The Project Coordinator was satisfied with the inputs from the Issue Identification Panel, he said,

... the process we used, we sent them all the information long before the two-day seminar we held in Edmonton. We sent them this *Dynamics of Diversity*, we sent them other material, and we gave them an assignment. We told them exactly what we wanted to do in identifying issues. And asked them, really, to come in identifying what they saw were five key issues as a starting point. And we got that from all of them, and the input we got from the outside people was just very, very good and very, very useful.

In contrast to the Coordinator's viewpoint, one informant remarked, "I think that this is a silly activity in that sense, identifying issues or areas of concern or debatable areas, if that's a word of the enterprise, but I don't think it was successful because of the influence of a few handpicked outsiders." He continued,

What I especially wondered about were the outside issue developers, and I understand from the grapevine that, indeed, possibly one, but maybe one or two people on the Issues Panel, were very influential on what came out of it, and I believe that some of the issues were to be expected; that they may in fact be non-issues, and that in any case they represented a limited view of this organization.

One informant was concerned about the outside people who were put in the Issue Identification Panel, he explained,

I can pick a committee to come up pretty close to the decision I want to come up. I can keep, depend on what kind of input you want, what kind of result that you want. Again, it's a necessary step in issue identification, somebody has to do it, but in contrast to the evolutionary approach, it suffers from the problems of who you put on the committee, because they will be like the blind men and the elephant, each one sees something different.

One informant considered that the procedure of the Issue Identification Seminar was

similar to what the government does when a big problem occurs. They set up Royal Commission and then the Royal Commission makes recommendations and they run for another ten years, and things go wrong again. So again they set up another Royal Commission and just go from one major task force to another one rather than carrying on a kind of monitoring that is required.

The 11-issue-statement which resulted from the Issue Identification Seminar was scheduled to be distributed to the Faculty members and stakeholder groups for obtaining feedback from them. As pointed out at the end of the Report--*Issues Facing the Faculty of Education* (Ingram & Worth, 1987a),

Confirmation of the issues to be addressed in the months ahead is a very critical phase of the Strategic Planning Project. If there are errors in issue identification, then the resolution decisions will also be in error. It is therefore important that members of the Faculty and other interested parties now ponder the issues and come to the feedback forums prepared to discuss and identify those issues which ought to be given priority consideration. At the forums there will be an opportunity to suggest how the issues might be refined (p. 7).

Therefore, in early October of 1987, the resulting statement--*Issues Facing the Faculty of Education* was distributed to all faculty members and stakeholder groups accompanied by Newsletter #3 and a notice containing the dates, times, and agenda for a series of Issue Identification Feedback Forums during the last week of October of 1987. The main purpose was to seek their assistance in clarifying the issues and in identifying the high-priority ones so as to initiate the issue resolution.

Confirming Issues Through Feedback Forums

Four Issue Identification Feedback Forums were held during the last week in October of 1987. Representatives of the stakeholder groups were invited to attend the forums of their choice, while, in an attempt to balance attendance, Faculty members were asked to attend on particular dates. Altogether, seventy-one faculty members (less than fifty percent of the total faculty) and representatives of stakeholder groups attended the four Forums. At the Forums, small groups of participants discussed issues and key questions which they felt ought to be given priority. Following this, each participant was given a Response Form on which to indicate their personal selection of four high and four low priority issues, and key questions for the high priority issues. Sixty-six Response Forms

were completed and then subsequently analyzed by the Project Coordinators. The resulting summary stated:

The issues were rated 1, 2, 3, or 4, with 1 being highest priority. The five issues receiving the highest rating were-No. 8, Mission, Goals and Priorities; No. 1, Teacher Education Models, No. 9, Organizational Structure, No. 5 Graduate Studies, and No. 6, Faculty Research. (See the order of the issues listed in pages 101 and 102 of this thesis)

These issues were rated 11, 10, 9, or 8, with 11 being lowest priority. The four issues receiving the lowest priority ratings were-No. 11, Operational Procedures, No. 10, Rewards Systems, No. 9, Organizational Structure, and No. 7, Leadership and Service Roles. It is interesting to note that Issue No. 9, Organizational Structure, received the third highest rating as well as the third lowest (Ingram & Worth, 1987b, p. 1).

Additionally, some other new issues and concerns were derived from the Forums, which were indicated in the resulting summary report--*Issue Identification Feedback Forums* (Ingram & Worth, 1987b, p. 1):

- Staffing strategy for the future should be considered. There will be many opportunities to appoint new professors in the next few years and the Faculty should set out clear policies. What kind of profile should the Faculty have in the year 2000? Should people who retire be replaced with specialists in new areas?
- How can we expand our resources? How can the Faculty update and expand its perceptions in relation to the current Canadian reality--whether economic or academic? How can we prepare education professionals for the broad spectrum of the workplace and contribute more effectively to the knowledge base or the practice of education nationally? We communicate poorly with other academic/professional disciplines, holding ourselves bounded by "Education". We also communicate poorly with business and industry--the "real" world for which education professionals supposedly educate people.
- How can bureaucratic priorities be made more compatible with faculty expectations and needs?
- How can we help students to be critical, independent thinkers and to think of ways to break with the traditions they have experienced and approve of?
- What professional code of ethics shall guide the behavior of the faculty members?
- All the issues are interconnected. Focussing on the interconnections may be more important than trying to deal with the "separate" issues (p. 10).

However, all these newly-derived issues had never been dealt with in the subsequent process of the Strategic Planning Project.

Reflections on Issue Identification Feedback Forums were varied according to the individual's involvement and experience. One faculty member noted,

The Issues Forums were not very successful. Few people turned up and many of them turned up by the sense of obligation. It was difficult to keep the discussion focus on particular issues, because many people had their own issues and it was difficult for people to understand what the goal was, what they were trying to get through the process. So I don't think the issues Forums were very good.

Another informant indicated his own experience and expressed his feeling about the Forums:

To be very frank and very honest about it, the parts of that process in which I participated, they had discussion groups, different groups in the faculty were set up as discussion groups, and they were given some topics to discuss and given a period of about a half-day in which to do it. But the group in which I was situated didn't really get through the first issue. It didn't reach any kind of agreement, let alone consensus, on even one issue out of maybe half a dozen. In fact, I don't think it's possible for such groups to come to a consensus. I would guess that same thing happened in the other groups.

One respondent recollected,

we did small group activities and the funny thing is that I don't remember the content of reaction. I did, however, feel less positive about the experience than I did about the interview. And once again I think it's probably because I thought in the group activity it's very difficult for me to influence the prevailing perspectives.

Another faculty member recalled that the one Forum he attended had a very small turnout.

"There were about fifteen at the one that I went to. And I guess what you have is the interested people show up of these things, and you wonder about the other hundred people where they are or if they are interested." However, one faculty member explained the reason for not attending the Forums,

I didn't attend any of the Issues Forums because I have a general belief that the process used in this phase was too tightly managed and controlled, that it wasn't what it was purported to be, namely, an open examination of a problem; so I didn't attend any of those, not because I didn't have time . . . because I believed that the process was largely window-dressing and that what the people running the Project, not the Dean, but the people running

the Project already had in mind what would happen. Not that they had a clear agenda, but that they were more interested in the process than in the outcome; and that the process had its own limitations. It seemed to me it was similar to a Delphi study where the monitor of the process had so much control over what happened because they could make decisions about discarding data, and I think in this case, in my opinion, as it turned out, they did. So I took little or no part in it except to read the stuff and keep my ear to the ground, because I didn't see it, frankly, as a serious issue.

One informant doubted whether this kind of Forum was a good process for actually articulating the diversity of viewpoints of the issues,

If people who are in the minority have a minority viewpoint, but one has to have a big concern about that in the strategic planning process, because if we do have dynamics of diversity, then the minority opinion might be oppressed by the majority opinion. That somehow the strategic planning process should acknowledge the diversity of viewpoints as well as a second agenda for creating a vision for the future of the unit.

One respondent talked about the pitfall of the Issues Forums in terms of the low attendance and the improper schedules.

Instead of calling a Faculty Forum, perhaps one of the Task Force leader might have been assigned to our Faculty Council Meeting and talked with us at Council. Because we came to Council meetings quite regularly and if it had been an agenda item, I think that it would have been high involvement. But if you schedule a meeting, they did try to make it easy for you to go, because they said either come this time or that time, or this time or that time. So, you had some choices. But sometime once you gave people a lot of choices it means come this time, this time, this time, or don't come at all. So people decided not to go at all.

Some faculty members felt disappointed because the issues they identified did not show up in the Report--*Issues Facing the Faculty of Education*. One informant, however, explained that the Report of the Issue Identification Feedback Forums did reflect what people considered to be issues and concerns. He noted,

I think most members of the faculty, they had very specific concern. And when those were aggregated and they had to be skimmed in a way in order to make them public. Then I think some faculty members would look at that and say, "No, I don't see the issue that I was concerned about in there." That's because they became generalized, became more abstract. So, with the concrete problem that some people might see not fit, they wouldn't see any in the Report.

Therefore, it was obvious that all of the issues were seen as high priority by some and low priority by others, were important but also interrelated, and that differences

occurred in the order in which issues might be dealt with. Because of constraints on resources, time, and logistics, not all issues could be investigated at the same time or in the same way. At last, the Project Coordinators decided to concentrate on the two areas considered to be of top priority: (1) Faculty Mission, Goals, and Priorities and (2) Models and Frameworks for Organizing Teacher Education Programs. It was also decided, however, that a start could be made on investigating the next three issues in order of priority: (3) Faculty Organization and Procedures, (4) Graduate Studies, and (5) Research (Ingram, 1989, pp. 5-6). All these issues selected would be addressed by two Task Forces and two Study Teams in Phase 3.

Phase 3: Alternatives for Issue Resolution

According to Ingram (1989), the main purposes of the third phase of the Strategic Planning Project were to investigate, generate, and consider alternative directions and approaches to resolving the issues identified during Phase 2 and to suggest an orientation for Phase 4, Planning for Action. The mechanism selected to meet these objectives consisted of two Task Forces which were set up for the two top priority issues--Faculty Mission, Goals, and Priorities and Models and Frameworks for Teacher Education and two Study Teams which were established for investigate Faculty Organization and Procedures and Graduate Studies and Research. The following section describes the procedures and approaches utilized in Phase 3.

Selecting Task Force and Study Team Leaders and Members

The first thing to do in Phase 3 was to choose the Task Force and Study Team leaders and members. Although there were only four Task Force and Study Team leaders, the Project Coordinators wanted to make sure that there was some representation across the Faculty. As one Coordinator recalled,

We didn't want to have more than one from any one department. So, again, we wanted to get people that had a reputation: They were respected by fellow faculty members, and, people that thought broadly about Faculty matters, not in narrow specializations, and also people who had had some kind of experience, broader experience, across the Faculty, and felt they knew more about it. The fact was, the leaders were selected on that basis. And, also, so with the people who sat on task forces. We tried to make sure, on task forces, that not only did we have representation across the Faculty, but that we tried to get representation of different kind of views, so that we had a sample of the Faculty representatives.

In November of 1987, the Coordinators drew up a list of names of people who might serve on the Task Forces and Study Teams and they checked those with the Dean to identify the people who might be the leaders. Then the Dean and the two Coordinators met the people who would be the leaders respectively and asked if they would like to head up the specific task force or study team. The Dean remembered when they met with the people who would serve as the four leaders,

we told them the kinds of things that we were hopeful would be the result of their efforts, we didn't tell them the ideas that had to come up with, we told them how we wanted those reports to eventually fit into the planning of the Faculty . . . so those people had been very well instructed.

On the other hand, as one Coordinator recollected that the Dean gave the task force and study team leaders some release time and also let them know that this was a very important Project and that what they were doing would certainly count in their annual reports for merits and salary.

In January of 1988, Newsletter #4 was distributed and made known the names of the four faculty members who would be chairing the Task Force on Faculty Mission, Goals and Priorities, the Task Force on Models and Frameworks for Organizing Teacher Education, the Study Team on Graduate Studies and Research, and the Study Team on Organization and Procedures respectively. The objectives and procedures for each Task Force and Study Team were also included.

As far as choosing the other members of the Task Forces and Study Teams, the two Coordinators had a list of people that they thought would be suitable to work on the particular study team or task force, which had been generated through interviews with

department heads and other Faculty of Education members who had considerable experience in Faculty-wide activities (Ingram, 1989). But they left to the leaders to actually choose people. As one task force leader noted, "The Dean, the coordinators, really gave the task force leaders a great deal of freedom. What they did was they asked me if I would chair this task force and really left up to me to decide the composition of the task force." Further, he explained,

I was provided with some names of people that they expressed interest in working with in the Project or had been recommended by the department chairs to work for the Project. But I was not to be restricted to that list. So, the first decision that I made all on my own was I would have one representative from each department. It seemed to me that the Task Force was looking at goals, and mission, and priorities, ought to be involved with the stakeholder groups. And any personal bias in that direction was that the ATA should be the stakeholder group. . . . I tried to make a mixture of people who had been around for a long time, and people who were relatively new, a mixture of men and women, and given different kinds of time people being around different ranks, and people who represented different kinds of interests within the departments, but most people I could work with and wanted to work with. I was allowed a great amount of luxury and idiosyncrasy in choosing people and the Dean and the Project Coordinators supported this throughout.

The other Task Force leader added,

They [Coordinators] gave us a list of names of people who might be interested in working, but I didn't use the list of names. . . . I took the calendar and went through each of the departments and tried to think of people whom I knew were really committed to the undergraduate program. And I checked off some of those people . . . I wanted to get people to do that work who were at least enthusiastic, willing to work with.

After almost one month's selection, the membership of the task forces and study teams had been determined. Then, a letter was sent to each department chair asking for agreement with the Task Force and Study Team members. At last, by the end of January of 1988, Newsletter #5 announced the name list of the Task Forces, consisting of six or ten members respectively, and the Study Teams, each consisting of three people. All members were selected from Faculty staff, except one from the Alberta Teachers' Association.

After the establishment of the Task Forces and Study Teams, two special reports:

Issues Identification Feedback Forums: A Report prepared for Task Forces and Study

Teams (Ingram and Worth, 1987b) and *Terms of Reference for Task Forces and Study Teams* (Ingram and Worth, 1987d) were distributed to all the members in order to acquaint them with their specific tasks, issues to be investigated, question to address, procedures, resources, and time limits.

At the beginning, the two Coordinators tried to keep the distinction between a Task Force and a Study Team. Afterwards, as one Study Team leader indicated, "What the Task Forces were doing and what we were doing as a Study Team were very similar . . . one of the things that happened was that the distinction between the Task Forces and the Study Teams seemed to be disappeared."

Formulating Mission, Goals, and Priorities

The major focus of investigation for the Task Force on Mission, Goals, and Priorities was the first issue: "How can the Faculty clarify its mission and goals, and its priorities, to make them compatible with the expectations held for the Faculty?" The major objectives of this Task Force were:

- (a) to develop alternative missions and sets of goals and priorities, and to consider how these might give direction to the activities of the Faculty and its units;
- (b) to consider the feasibility of each alternative under the conditions affecting the Faculty;
and
- (c) to recommend approaches the Faculty might use in further developing, selecting, and implementing a mission statement and set of goals and priorities (Ingram and Worth, 1987d, pp. 2-3).

First of all, the six people of this Task Force met every other week throughout the term (January through April, 1988) and started to talk about what a mission statement was. They began to review the literature on mission statements in the planning process and examples of mission statements developed by other universities. As the Task Force leader mentioned, "We didn't find the literature terribly helpful. They essentially tell us that a

mission statement is a statement that tries to capture what our organization is all about and to provide a kind of direction for it."

Meanwhile, they had learned that a university faculty was not the best place to be dealing with mission statements. Mission statements worked best in organizations that were hierarchical where the administrators had the power to impose a mission statement. A faculty of education at any university was a conglomerate of independent scholars who worked for the institution and got paid for it and could not be disciplined for adhering to the policies of the organization. When a university instructor got into his or her classroom, what happened in the classroom was really functional work that the instructor decided. No matter how many mission statements were posted around the faculty, a person could ignore them and not be penalized. Therefore, university was not the best place to be dealing with mission and goals statement.

The leader indicated "we started off with a bit of suspicion about a mission statement. But we recognized that was our job." Then they reviewed the University planning document, *The Next Decade and Beyond* and got a general indication of where the University was trying to go. "We took very seriously at this point in our work that the University has three kinds of missions: teaching, research, and service." Based on this trinity of university functions, the Task Force was broken up into three groups and produced three mission statements: the Faculty as traditional expert; the Faculty as servant to society; and the Faculty as academic entrepreneur.

In order to include everyone in the Faculty and have them react to and indicate preferences among the mission statements, in late March of 1988, they had circulated the three mission statements to the entire Faculty and the ATA reaction panel which served as a "sounding board" for the Task Force's ideas as they developed. They set up a forum on two afternoons and invited people to come to make representations to them. The Task Force leader said with great disappointment, "We were expecting lively discussions and also the people coming to tell us what to do. And eventually no one came. It was a

immense block." However, there were several people who did respond to the mission statements by mail.

The Task Force had learned several significant lessons. One was that the Faculty members seemed not to notice that, said the Task Force leader,

We had devised three different perspectives, because some people would say, "well, I like this from this mission statement, but I like that from that mission statement." And what we were trying to do was to distinguish three very simple orientations. And people would make the match and it would like a little bit from socialism, a little bit from capitalism, a little bit from fascism, a little bit from communism, and turned into a working system. I felt, look, all or nothing. They were such different commitments that you really could not mix them up.

The second one was that people had private agendas. People would pick up on things and that was the only thing that they saw in it. People would read selectively to fit their own bias. The third was some people suggested that a mission statement should be short and in a sentence or two to tell everyone what the place was all about. The fourth thing was to make a distinction between the Faculty's mandate and the Faculty's mission. The Faculty's mandates were those things which the Faculty had to do regardless of their orientation towards them. As the Task Force leader pointed out,

We can't change that we are a teacher education institution. We have the mandates from the University and the Government of Alberta that we are preparing teachers and we are not in a position to change that. So, that's part of our mandate rather than our mission. So we begin to see the mission statement as accepting the mandate and providing an orientation in it.

The major feedback which came from the ATA reaction Panel was that "They gave us a sentence and the sentence kept reappearing in our work, in the document. The Faculty of Education is the professional faculty for the teacher profession," said the Task Force leader. One informant from the ATA indicated,

When we got the first mission statement, it was quite lengthy, and it seemed to be such that it would accommodate everything that the Faculty was now doing. It didn't seem to focus the efforts of the Faculty on any one ideal mission, and as a result, we suggested that the mission, pure and simple, should be that "the Faculty of Education is a professional faculty of the teaching profession," and that's what it stated. That wording came from here. . . . We suggested that teaching was more important than either research or service to the profession, and though both of those were

important, the primary function of the Faculty was to prepare teachers, and all of the rest of the things the Faculty did ought to be done with the acknowledgement of what the primary function was.

Based on these responses, this Task Force tried to develop the mission statement in promoting excellence in teaching and learning. "We would be model learners. We would be open to new ideas. We would be the best example of teaching we can be," emphasized the Task Force leader.

Another concern of the Task Force was that the Faculty was becoming fragmented. Therefore, in writing the mission statement, they thought that should provide a sense of community to the Faculty and try to bring the Faculty back together again. As the Task Force leader indicated,

... what we tried to do was three things: One was to rebuild the sense of community in the Faculty; the second was to accept that emphasis on research output had become very high in the Faculty and we didn't want to do anything against that. But we did want to express the importance of teaching that we felt maybe teaching had been getting shrunk in the Faculty in the past few years. And the third theme was that the research that we did in education, in this Faculty should be grounded in practice that the practical reality of teachers and learners in a variety of educational settings, not just the schools, but a variety of educational settings should represent the concerns of the Faculty in their research.

In June of 1988, the President of Mount Saint Vincent University who was a former member of the Issue Identification Panel met with the Task Force leaders. What she said, according to the Task Force leader, was that "a mission statement is useless if it doesn't fit with the larger institution's mission: the Faculty of Education's mission has to be in accord with the University's mission." So, the Task Force, accepting this, paid quite close attention to the University's planning documents. They quickly stopped reading and became a discussion group. After each meeting they wrote and incorporated their discussions into mission and goals statements. "And these would be circulated, next meeting with summary of what we did, criticized, and I revised and circulated that, write, revise, and rewrite, and revise, until it is like this right now. This was basically how we worked," summarized the Task Force leader.

Finally, the proposed mission statement that the Task Force arrived at was that:

The University of Alberta Faculty of Education is the professional faculty for the teaching profession; teaching and learning are at the heart of its work. Although the Faculty shares this concern with others, it has the specific responsibility to discover and disseminate knowledge about teaching and learning. This responsibility is fulfilled in a number of ways.

All the Faculty's programs are teacher education programs. Whatever their roles, its graduates will be teachers first and foremost.

The Faculty endeavors to promote the view that to be a teacher is to continue being a learner. Programs are based on the assumption that a professional teacher continues to question, to reflect, to seek knowledge, and to be open to change. Although much of this learning takes place informally, the faculty provides opportunities for continued learning through graduate programs, continuing education programs, service to the profession, and research. The development of critical thinking and empathic understanding is at the core of all its programs.

Because it is intimately concerned with the improvement of teaching and learning, the Faculty strives to integrate theory and practice. Its programs are developed in cooperation with the profession to ensure that the study of teaching and learning is practically grounded.

Research in the Faculty of Education focuses on questions about teaching and learning from many perspectives, seeking to understand teaching and learning so as to provide direction and support for their improvement for the betterment of students.

The Faculty of Education exemplifies excellent teaching for the profession and for the academic community. Not only does it generate and disseminate knowledge about teaching and learning; the Faculty attempts to incorporate it in practice (Pearson et al., 1989, p. 13).

Developing Teacher Education Models

The issue set out for the Task Force of Teacher Education Models to study was: "What emerging models or frameworks for organizing teacher preparation programs should be considered for adoption?" The major question included four sub-questions. The objectives for this Task Force to achieve were to develop alternative models for the preparation of teachers, to consider the feasibility of each alternative under the conditions affecting the Faculty, and to recommend approaches the Faculty might be using in further developing, selecting, and implementing one or more of these models (Ingram & Worth, 1987d, pp. 5-6).

This ten-member Task Force got together and arranged to meet every Wednesday afternoon for two or three hours. They began to study the materials on teacher education models gathered from 12 North American universities. "I think the first task was just simply to divide that information amongst everyone and we would examine and come back and try to summarize the things that we see as starting points," the Task Force leader stressed.

As their work progressed, the Task Force leader noted, "We found the questions [assigned] were getting in our way. . . . So, we just stopped using the questions. Because they tended to narrow the focus of the things that we were talking about," he continued,

we couldn't worry about the questions, we tended to get further, we began to think in a very linear way, we got four questions, we answer question No.1, No.2, No.3, No.4, and yet, none of those at least the way that we began to see, was the key question. The actual problems we were having in teacher education were much deeper and I guess the other thing was we began to explore and read about a lot of programs and what was going on in a lot of places.

After reviewing the existing teacher education programs, the Task Force found that although a number of the programs included interesting features, none was radically different from those that were integral parts of programs in the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta. However, they provided with some insights into alternative frameworks of teacher education for the Task Force.

The Task Force had explored the literature in teacher education and come to the conclusion that there was very little substance associated with claims about the efficacy of innovative advances in teacher education. Therefore, "most of our meetings turned out to be seminars that we debated back and forth with each other, and we would be on a weekly basis having one or two people in the group preparing short discussion papers on one of the things that we were finding troublesome . . . we were dealing with that at philosophical level, not with the particulars as we needed," the Task Force leader mentioned.

They also examined the current program of teacher education at the University of Alberta in terms of the participants' reactions. Three sets of data were reviewed:

(1) *Teachers' Evaluation of Their Preparation for Teaching* (Miklos, et al, 1987); (2) a study involving fourteen recent graduates conducted by the Department of Elementary Education in 1986; and (3) data collected by the Task Force members through conversations with graduating students currently enrolled in the teacher education program of the University of Alberta. The Task Force found that the current teacher education programs were criticized by the participants as being (a) relatively ineffective in preparing prospective teachers to deal with the realities of the classroom; (b) fragmented into discrete courses in curriculum and instruction, educational psychology, foundations of education, and educational administration; and (c) with a wide gap between the content of education courses and the daily requirements of teaching.

In response to these criticisms, the Task Force finally settled on the way of viewing as teacher educators, "What does it mean to teach?" and "How does one learn to do it?" They had found out that teaching was really an individual thing. In addition to this, the Task Force leader expressed their viewpoints on teacher education models,

And we saw that better teachers were those that reflected on things they were doing. Then based on that reflection they would alter their actions and that would be a cyclical thing . . . we saw teachers should have power in their own classroom and their own situation to try these different things. The other one of our assumptions was the idea that some groups thought teacher education should socialize new teachers into the system. And our point was that teachers should feel comfortable enough to go into the system, but should also feel empowered enough to change the things that were troublesome and bothersome.

In terms of the alternative teacher education model, the ATA representative advocated the apprenticeship model. "But we saw that model as being deficient for the teachers eventually feeling some types of empowerment for the group with which they were working," the Task Force leader concluded.

After a whole year's study, the Task Force on Teacher Education Models finally focused on (1) the Concerns Based Model which means that the content of a teacher education program should be matched to the level of concerns (self, task, impact) being experienced by the students enrolled in it and (2) the Critically Reflective Model which

makes it clear that teaching is not simply, or even mainly, an applied science and the complexity and situational nature of the teaching act means that very few rules and procedures can be prescribed for all people and all places. Both models had important implications for the design and sequencing of teacher education programs. Based on these two models, the Task Force eventually recommended a blending of the two approaches that teacher education should be based upon reflection-in-action (Beauchamp, et al., 1989, p. 23).

Developing Alternative Structures and Procedures

The Study Team on Organization and Procedures consisted of three members. The major issue assigned for them to study was: "What type of organization will best ensure goal achievement as well as a productive and satisfying work environment for Faculty members?" In addition, four other aspects in relation to Faculty organization and procedures were also to be investigated: planning, implementing, and evaluating the teacher preparation program; the reward system; the operational procedures of the Faculty; and the leadership and service role of the Faculty. Two major themes were derived from these issues: administrative structure and procedures, and assessment of the Faculty performance, and these guided this Study Team's study activities. The responsibility of the Study Team was to search for information and prepare background papers to assist the task force which would be established at a later date in developing and considering the feasibility of alternative organizational structures and operating procedures--communications, goal setting, policy making, planning, programming, decision making, monitoring, coordinating, and reviewing (Ingram & Worth, 1987d, pp. 12-3).

The Study Team started with a series of discussions and had identified the major topics which were related to (1) the organizational structure of faculties of education, (2) the nature of the practice in which professors of education engaged, and (3) the operation of reward systems in both faculties of education and other professional faculties.

Then, the Study Team examined the available reports on the organizational structure of a number of faculties of education and summarized the procedures of their promotion and performance assessment procedures. At the same time, the Study Team also carried out a literature review on administration of faculties of education and had identified the conceptual point of departure for the consideration of organizational issues.

However, the practices elsewhere and literature still held limited potential as aids to addressing the issues manifested in the particular conditions of this Faculty. Therefore, two studies were conducted by this Study Team in the Faculty of Education, one was an interview and the other, a questionnaire survey of the Faculty members.

The interviews were with the Dean of Education, department chairs, and Associate Deans of the Faculty, and focused on the organizational structure of the Faculty, selected operational procedures, and the performance evaluation of Faculty members. The questionnaire survey was jointly conducted by this Study Team and the Study Team of Research and Graduate Studies during the summer of 1988, and focused on the Faculty members' perceptions of selected aspects of work and reward structures. Six-three faculty members participated in the survey. The results of the survey were presented in the report: *Faculty Members' Views of Selected Aspects of Work and Reward Structures* (Miklos, et al., 1988).

From this series of research activities, the Study Team had found:

- (1) The Faculty was an organization characterized by dynamic tensions between structural units, levels, and roles as well as between various processes;
- (2) An enduring organizational problem was that of reconciling and balancing somewhat opposing and contradictory forces, a process which involved ongoing structuring and restructuring;
- (3) The tension between Faculty and departments might be addressed through changing the focus of attention in activities of the Dean's Advisory Committee and the Faculty Council in order to place greater emphasis on the integrating function;

- (4) Concerns about responsibility for greater attention to planning, implementing, and evaluating the teacher education program at the Faculty level might be addressed through modified definition of functions of the associate deans; and
- (5) The tension between individual and organization regarding workload and review of performance could be addressed through increased interaction between the individual faculty member and his or her department chair (Miklos, et al., 1989, pp. 42-51).

Developing Faculty Role in Graduate Studies and Research

The major task assigned for the three-member Study Team on Graduate Studies and Research was to search for information and prepare background papers to assist the future task force in developing and considering the feasibility of alternative roles for the Faculty with respect to graduate studies and research, including alternative models for governing, coordinating, and facilitating graduate and research programs. Two issues were to be the major focus of the investigation: (1) Should graduate studies within the Faculty be more closely geared to the continuing education needs of educators? (2) What constitutes appropriate research and scholarly activity for a professional faculty, and how can these be facilitated? A third issue "How can the Faculty more clearly define and implement its leadership/service role in improving professional practice?" as it pertained to graduate studies and research, was also to be considered (Ingram & Worth, 1987d, pp. 9-10).

The Study Team eventually focused on the second issue, because it had ramifications for the other two issues. As they started to work, one member of the Study Team felt, "sometimes it was quite vague as to what was the intent or what was the intended product of these deliberations, what were we supposed to come up with, what were some of the parameters of this thing, and so on."

However, they first began with reviewing four categories of the related literature:

- (1) Documents of the Strategic Planning Project; (2) Reports on Current Status and Trends of the Faculty; (3) Available documents related to research activities within the Faculty; and

- (4) Literature on profiles of productive researchers, age and faculty productivity, graduate programs, and general references related to research in faculties of education.

Secondly, they conducted interviews with several informants selected to represent a small cross-section of those with a vested interest in the Faculty, ranging from Faculty members representing each academic rank to senior department, Faculty, and library administrators. Most of the interview data reflected the same concerns voiced by the Faculty members in the interviews carried out in the earlier stage of the Strategic Planning Project.

Thirdly, together with the Study Team on Organization and Procedures, this Study Team conducted a faculty survey which took the form of an opinion questionnaire designed to elicit information on staff perceptions of their working environment. Sixty-three faculty members participated in this study. The results was presented in the report, *Faculty Members' Views of Selected Aspects of Work and Reward Structures* (Miklos, et al., 1988).

After the Study Team finished these research activities, one team member indicated,

Then we began to think that this study team was different from a task force. The study team was not to come up with particular recommendations and plans for action for things to happen in the Faculty, but more the preparation of a background paper. So we didn't feel as much pressure to have to focus on things that could be operationalized, so we could spend time looking at and even just discussing what was relevant at all to a career as a faculty member in terms of research, publication, carrying on graduate studies commitments, working with graduate students, and that kind of thing. Instead we just developed a set of category themes, which partly showed up here in this report.

Therefore, three major findings were presented in this Study Team's final report:

- 1) The Faculty of Education was expected to exhibit leadership on several fronts, such as, collaborative and cooperative research projects with the field, contract work, and consultancy.

- 2) Staff needed to be encouraged to combine teaching and research instead of viewing them as separate entities. It might be folly to attempt to involve all staff in scholarly research productivity, and
- 3) The Faculty's graduate program influenced both leadership and research. Once a defined mission and goals statement was in place, it would be easier to decide on the most appropriate form of graduate program (Fishburne, et al., 1989, pp. 70-72).

Interactions among Task Forces and Study Teams

The Task Forces and Study Teams worked in collaboration with one another and with the Coordinators of the Project. By-weekly regular meetings of the Task Force and Study Team leaders and the Project Coordinators were held to consider problems, report on progress, and share ideas. Three all-member seminars were also held during the Phase 3:

- (1) In March of 1988, in the Seminar of Orientation to the task, the Dean and the Project Coordinators commented on the importance of and expectations of the Phase 3: Alternatives for Issue Resolution of the Strategic Planning Project and the members had an opportunity to exchange and share ideas, concerns and information.
- (2) In the Seminar of May of 1988, members of the Task Forces and Study Teams provided feedback, exchanged information, and considered the interrelatedness of issue identification.
- (3) In November of 1988, in the Seminar on Alternatives for Action, members of Task Forces and Study Teams jotted down reactions to the Task force and Study Team Reports, shared with each other during the small group discussions, and gave thoughts to the substance and form of action which could flow from the Task Force and Study Team Reports.

The Dean was present at all three Seminars. One informant said, "That was actually the time that we could sort sources and report to the Dean and so he could get the end result."

In reaction to the structure of the Phase 3: Alternatives for Issue Resolution, one Task Force leader indicated that "very helpful to me was the bi-weekly based meetings. The Project Coordinators, the Task Force leaders and the Study Teams leaders, the six of us had bi-weekly meetings to discuss how things were going. And what we did was we shared frustrations, talked about progress, and gave each other supportive ideas." Another Study Team leader pointed out,

There was a lot of interactions between the group leaders . . . the meetings with the group leaders were quite valuable . . . people knew how your group was doing, and what they were doing and these were also quite encouraging, because when you started, you might not be going fast enough, but you found out other groups were struggling in the same way.

In relation to how the four Task Force and Study Team reports could be consistent with one another, one informant indicated that the structure had always provided some way of communicating with one another among the groups and the Project Coordinators. As one informant mentioned,

I didn't worry about what other groups were doing so much. We had our task we were trying to do. We knew it was a part of the big picture. We always knew what the big picture was . . . we didn't work together, yet they were pretty consistent. When I saw the mission statement and I didn't read it until they came back in late August, first time I saw theirs and I say "Geez, this is pretty in line with what we were doing." . . . They did tie together quite nicely in that way.

However, each group was expected and encouraged by the Project Coordinators to deviate from the original expectations held for them, if they found it was necessary or desirable. Most of the deviations were discussed with the Project Coordinators. One informant commented on this, "I think it's better to have the independence that was there amongst the groups so that they could say the things they wanted to say, and then if you see some unity in it, then it's good; it means that people at least have some consensus on some of these things, but not to have forced it from the beginning."

Reporting Procedural Outcomes

The final Report of each Task Force and Study Team was presented to the Project Coordinators by late December of 1988. There were several major differences from the original plans. First, the due time of the final Report of each Task Force and Study Team was delayed for about a full semester. Second, time and resource constraints made it impossible for either Task Force to fully develop more than one alternative model, as was suggested in their terms of reference. Third, the Study Team Reports which included some appropriate suggestions and recommendations, especially that of the Study Team on Faculty Organization and Procedures, were more like the Task Force Reports than were originally intended in their terms of reference (Ingram, 1989, pp. 5-6).

One informant explained that it was time constraints which had slowed down the process of the Reports,

There was some release time, just getting back to the workload aspect of it, that was supposed to be available. I should put "supposed to be" because, indeed, it was available to the leaders of the Study Teams and Task Forces. But by November and December [of 1987] most of us had made our commitments for the second term and it was not easy to identify activities that one could asked to be released from. So, I think a number of us had difficulties in giving the activities the priority which it was supposed to have from January to June [of 1988]. It was very difficult because of the continuing commitment. I was able to get some consideration for being involved in the Project, but I think it's fair to say that it was not really to the extend of having release time that the Dean and the Project Coordinators were willing to grant. But the reality of the situation was such that there was no place to get the release time from. So I think, as I recall, very early in our discussions as a group of Task Forces and Study Team leaders with the Coordinators, we assumed that the real deadline would be more like September [1988], that it wouldn't be possible to get the work done . . . it needs some months in order to put together the Report.

However, in contrast to the above explanation, one faculty member perceived,

The timeline for this Project should be shorter. For the reason to maintain interest and enthusiasm and commitment, I think it takes too long. I think it should be shorter at least half a year. I think where the study has bogged down is the Task Forces and Study Teams. There was a long period of silence when those groups worked and what they have done is a sort of lost to sight, because now you have some very general recommendations and ideas here. You wonder, if it's necessary to have groups work that long to produce these . . . it goes on too long. It leaves a lot of people behind. I think the ball has been fumbled a little bit.

Exploring and Mapping the Future of the Faculty

The Reports of the two Task Forces and two Study Teams were finalized by the end of the year of 1988. The Project Coordinator [the other Coordinator retired in mid-1988] and his associates pulled them together and prepared a report for the Dean in late January of 1989, which included implications and recommendations made by the Project Team for the final phase of the Strategic Planning Project--Taking Action. Then the Dean approved the Report and wrote the "Forward" and "An Analysis of the Task Force and Study Team Reports" for the final Report. At last, in February of 1989, the final Report of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project: entitled, *Exploring and Mapping the Future: A Focus on Priority Issues--A Report on Alternatives for Issue Resolution by the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project* was completed.

This Report included three sections. In Section I, the Dean and the Project Coordinator provided a backdrop for Sections II and III by presenting the major objectives of the Project, the key issues facing the Faculty, and the main procedures used to achieve these objectives. The Dean said in this section,

I hope you who study this report will take time to react to what you read and to share your ideas so that others may know your views. Let us not allow complacency or indifference to condemn this report and process to the archives for historical reference. Instead, let us use it as a springboard for lively and spirited discussion and as a basis for change, affirmation, and renewal (Patterson, 1989, p. 6)

Section II contained the Reports of the two Task Forces and two Study Teams. Each of the Reports presented the procedures used, information and findings obtained, and recommendations for issue resolution. Finally, in Section III, the Dean highlighted the reports of the Task Forces and Study Teams and provided a brief analysis on them. The Report concluded with the recommendations made by the Project Coordinator for consideration in moving into the Final Phase--Taking Action of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project.

According to the Dean's analysis, the Task Force Report on Mission, Goals, and Priorities highlighted the significance of building within the Faculty a spirit of community which was founded on a sense of shared mission, one that was understood and accepted by partners in the profession and by students in classes of the Faculty. The four goal areas proposed by the Task Force invited the Faculty to be more responsive to the needs of the profession, more involved with it, and more concerned about helping to ensure the life-long professional growth of teachers. The mission and goals statement also provided a visionary and challenging message to the Faculty to invite the Faculty (1) to be more centered on the improvement of teaching and learning and (2) to look toward ways of providing leadership through example, collaborative relationships, greater interest in its graduates, and more attention to the relevance and effect of its teaching and research. The Dean considered that this type of mission and goals statement provided clear direction and an inspiring prospect.

The Task Force Report on Teacher Education Models recommended that reflection-in-action serve as the underpinning of the programs within the Faculty of Education. The Dean considered that "this emphasis makes the school the centre of enquiry, encourages teachers to view themselves as researchers, and ensures that teacher education does more than stress technical or mechanistic responses to pedagogical concerns." (Patterson, 1989, p. 81). This report also underscored the importance to student teachers of learning how to reframe their classroom teaching in light of their growing understanding of the factors which influence student learning. This perspective was in harmony with the mission and goals statement of the first Task Force Report.

In response to the Report of the Study Team on Organization and Procedures, the Dean indicated it encouraged (1) flexible, open, and responsive structures, boundaries, and alignments to promote the Faculty a more dynamic organization; (2) to build new relationships to evolve from shared interests and involvements; (3) to foster more Faculty-wide program planning, innovation, and implementation; and (4) to initiate measures

designed to find a new balance among individual, department, and Faculty authority in order to solve the tensions and contradictions among them (Patterson, 1989, pp. 81-2).

In reaction to the Study Team Report on Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean pointed out,

Central to the Report is the acknowledgment that research does not detract from teaching; on the contrary, research is integral to effective teaching. Among the observations cited is the recognition that research within the Faculty should be more closely linked to the professional community and should be built into the course work and practicum of the undergraduate program. Numerous ideas are considered as how our research effort and graduate programs may be improved, thus providing a sound basis for follow-up action (Patterson, 1989, p. 82).

In the last section of the Final Report, the Project Coordinator made 12 items of recommendations for the Action Planning Phase. It was recommended that

- (1) the Dean establish a feedback process to obtain reactions to the final Report;
- (2) the Dean set up a structure, which consisted of a Coordinator at the associate or assistant dean level, and procedures for coordinating the action planning phase;
- (3) procedures be established for the consideration and adoption of the mission and goals statement in the Report of the Task Force on Mission, Goals, and Priorities;
- (4) each department and service unit be asked to review and modify its mission and goals to bring them into line with that of the Faculty;
- (5) procedures be established to maximize the extent to which the mission and goals of the Faculty and its units drive their policies and programs;
- (6) a team be set up to develop teacher education programs based upon the concepts contained in the Report of the Task Force on Teacher Education Models;
- (7) a Centre of Excellence for Teacher Education be established;
- (8) the Dean consider the suggested approaches in the Report of the Study Team on Organization and Procedures with respect to the structures and functions of the Dean's Office and the Dean's Advisory Committee;

- (9) the Action Planning Committee review the role and operations of the Faculty Council and bring them to address issues at the Faculty level and focus on major policies;
- (10) the Action Planning Committee, in collaboration with the Faculty Salaries and Promotions Committee, initiate a process to examine and develop the policies, procedures, and criteria relating to staff salaries, promotions, workload, and performance evaluation, with the intent of bringing these more into line with the concepts contained in the Report of Study Team on Organization and Procedures;
- (11) the Action Planning Committee initiate a process to study and modify the basic organizational structure of the Faculty in terms of its appropriateness for furthering the mission and goals of the Faculty and for facilitating and coordinating the programs of the Faculty; and
- (12) a task force be established to develop policies and recommendations with respect to the graduate studies and research responsibilities of the Faculty. (Ingram, 1989, pp. 84-7)

By the end of February of 1989, the Final Report: *Exploring and Mapping the Future* and Newsletter #7 were distributed to the Faculty members and stakeholder groups, accompanied by a complimentary note from the Dean. In his note, the Dean invited all the people who shared this Report to provide reactions and viewpoints which would be of value to the Faculty in this undertaking. In Newsletter #7, the Project Coordinator gave a very brief introduction to the final Report and declared that this was the time to move into the final stage of the Strategic Planning Project, planning for action. Additionally, a personal note from the Project Coordinator was attached, which indicated that the present Coordinator's responsibilities for the Strategic Planning Project had come to an end with the release of the Report: *Exploring and Mapping the Future*, because of his retirement. A new Coordinator was recommended to be appointed for the final and most vital phase of the Project: planning for action.

Reflecting upon the Final Report

In reflecting upon the final report, one informant pointed out,

In a general sense, I support the directions that the Strategic Planning Study is proposing in the Final Report. That is, I like the idea of teacher education in reflective practice, I like the formulation of mission and goals that the goal study group proposed. I think that the only concern I would have about the Final Report is that I'm not sure what kind of action, how we proceed to act on it. I think maybe the report deliberately took the notion that they would give directions, but that they would not have highly specific and concrete recommendations. . . . I think we need further leadership. If we don't have further leadership in the Dean's Office to push away at the directions that the Final Report suggests that we won't go anywhere. The Report will not have very much influence.

Another informant expressed his feeling about the Report,

I was pleased with everything I have seen there. Again, as people read about it, I don't know if they know the difficulty of putting these things together when you were working in a group sort of thing. I think, the mission statement, obviously, I like it because it's in line with my philosophy quite a bit. And I can relate to that one quite easily. The teacher education model one is fine as far as it goes, but I think it's only the starting place and there is lot of work to be done in that area, there is lot of work that have been done in that area, working at these ideas, the reflective teacher. The other two reports I realized the difficulty of talking about structure, because structure is going to have a big impact on a lot of things, but it at least provided a lot of information to think about it and certainly it would reach some discussions in the future. I assume that's part of the action plan that begins to get people moving towards some of these things.

However, one informant felt disappointed with the Final Report, he said,

It looks to me like a collection of several position papers . . . the Dean's comments disappointed me profoundly if they were to represent a summary of the official viewpoint or his sense of this process, I thought to myself all was lost. I believe that I did look at the recommendations . . . did we need to go through these tremendous processes in order to come out with those recommendations? And I would add that if in this final document the *Exploring and Mapping the Future*, if those did represent four separate position papers, there were four committees that also worked in separate situations, why would the structures in place then bring those different sensibilities together and begin to tease out vision or map. There was no map of the future in there. There was an exploration but there was no mapping, there was no vision.

One Faculty member indicated that the final document did not reflect clearly about the major issues that he and his colleagues identified,

I think that the major issue as to whether we should be primarily an undergraduate teacher preparation faculty or whether we should primarily be

a research faculty has been lost. . . . The University has indicated that they are going to be the senior institution within the Province and that research and graduate studies will be much more important than it is and when we read this document we are going to maintain ourselves as undergraduate faculty.

Another faculty member summed up with this viewpoint, "It seems to me the process of research feeding teaching and learning was not sufficiently stressed . . . if they are not going to realize the necessity for each staff member to do research as well as teaching and service, and then, most of the colleges can take over what had been done here." The other informant also commented on this issue,

. . . because as professors of the university, all of us in the Faculty of Education have to satisfy the criteria that the university community generally accepts for success, for scholarly success. An important one there is research and publication; another important one is teaching, of course; another one is the service to the profession. So that it isn't a single kind of view or direction; it's a multi-directional kind of orientation. If people are going to focus only on teacher education, then this place should not be in the university, and it should be a teachers' college.

However, one Coordinator strongly disagreed with this point, he noted,

Our key mission here should be the study of and preparation of educators. Now, that includes educators at all levels, up to doctorate levels, whether it's in administration or counselling or curriculum, whatever it is, that's our key role, and that's an educational role, and it comes through here, too, that the type of research we do should be for that end. We're not going to stop doing research, but what we do should be furthering the knowledge and improving the practice of education. That's what it should be about, but many people have lost track of that, I think. So our recommendations hit at that, and I think one of the problems about bringing about change is that change really could change the attitudes of many people. Many people don't really see themselves as in the business; they view themselves more as university, that our job is to search for truth or something. So that's one of the problems . . . It's what is the vision and the orientation of people, and that their vision and orientation is that they're like a liberal arts college in a university where they're just to do little bits of research and write little articles and that, then they don't have the vision that's intended, I think, by this mission and the goals statement, and even the other things, the stuff that's written about research and that, I think a lot of them bend the way towards that, or lead the way toward that. If we're to be effective, then we have to do the kinds of long-range programmatic research that will lead to not just improved knowledge, but improved practice in education.

Specifically, one informant felt that the mission and goals statements were not very valuable: "It seems to me those kinds of statements are so broad and so general that they can include almost anything, and they don't help very much to set priorities." Another

added, "If you're going to have a mission, it should be short, it should be fairly direct, and it should provide focus."

Some informants perceived that the Final Report "made a number of trivial proposals, such as establishing a Center for Research and Teacher Education, which was a foolish idea, which did not survive even in the rich United States." However, some fundamental problems considered by some faculty members were missing in the final Report. One informant, reflecting on this by saying,

One is that a major issue should be a recommendation on the faculty aging and there should be a recommendation related to faculty renewal, faculty retirement, and engaging new faculty, and what plan and strategies are there to bring new blood in a orderly systematic fashion; what university, or what faculty resources are going to be in place to do that sort of thing for the next twenty years or so, because when you look at the aging chart of the next 20 years, it's a major transition period. Alternative perspectives of education, the field of education is much, much broader now than teacher preparation and I refer specifically to postsecondary education. The teacher preparation model is not an appropriate model for all of the professional development needs, of continuing teacher education, or of postsecondary or adult education. And the graduate education I noticed in the recommendations there is a small reference to the graduate education, but this university created the strategic planning document called *The Next Decade and Beyond*. What in this document has been done to look at that document and place this document in context with that? And one of the issues there is that the university wants to move to a greater degree of activity in graduate education. Most of the recommendations in here deal with teacher preparation, undergraduate programs. Where does this strategic planning document fit in the university strategic planning?

However, the Dean believed that the specific changes recommended in the Final Report as a whole might contribute to an environment and an outlook in the Faculty which would foster more interest and effective service as teachers and researchers and help create the type of ethos in the Faculty that would contribute significantly to an improvement in teacher education (Patterson, 1989, p. 82).

As indicated by the Project Coordinator, the Task Forces and Study Teams had explored alternative futures which might be possible for the Faculty and its stakeholders to select; they have also suggested directions and orientations to guide the invention and development of solutions to issues identified in Phase 2 of the Strategic Planning Project.

The Final Phase, Action Planning, would provide the acid test of how successful the process had been. This final phase would determine to what extent the analysis and interpretation of the information collected, the issues identified, and the orientations and approaches taken to issue resolution were aligned with the understandings, values, and goals of Faculty members, the University community, the professions served, and the provincial government. The success of the action planning process would depend upon the heavy commitment to the principles and the goals of this planning process of all Faculty members--but especially those at the highest levels in the departments and the Faculty, as well as of those who were at the highest levels in the University and in provincial government (Ingram, 1989, pp. 88-9).

Phase 4: Action Planning

One month later after the final Report was distributed, the former Project Coordinator made several recommendations to the Dean with respect to the proposed feedback procedures on the final report:

- (1) a small feedback planning committee be established to conduct the feedback seminars in May or June of 1989;
- (2) each seminar should be sponsored by the Dean; and
- (3) the purposes of the seminars be to provide feedback on the Task Force and Study Team Reports and on the Recommendations made by the Coordinator for the final stage of the Project--Action Planning.

In addition to that, the former Coordinator noted, "I have recommended to the Dean that to really push it forward, there needs to be a person in the Dean's Office, who will take the key responsibility for moving on it."

Planning for Action

In reaction to these recommendations, the Dean said, "I have hoped to involve an Associate or Assistant Dean in the next phase of it, but unfortunately, the individual I had in mind isn't available. Now, I'm thinking that I probably need to play a more active part in it rather than have an associate or assistant Dean to do it for me." Further, the Dean talked about his plan for action planning,

I'll use the chairmen [Task Force and Study Team leaders] of those various committees to play an active role and help discuss their committee reports with the Faculty. For instance, Dr. Pearson on the mission statement, I had in mind, we'll try to schedule several meetings with the Faculty at large, for his committee can present the viewpoints of the report; for people can react to it where they can offer different viewpoints so that we can keep that discussion open. Similarly, Dr. Beauchamp and his committee on the reflective teaching models for the undergraduate degree, I am going to try and involve them meeting with different departments of the Faculty, getting some kind of small group discussions going on that topic.

As for the Report on the alternative role of the Faculty on Graduate Studies and Research, the Dean planned to focus on it next year. "Next year we'll elevate the study Report on Graduate Studies and Research to this same level of decision making and thought and while we are doing that we will have a theme or new topic that a new study team will work on it." With regard to the Report on Structure and Organization, the Dean wanted to implement it on his own, since there were a number of recommendations made in the Report. He, then, explained,

I don't need to have a lot of discussions on this item. For instance, they talk about the importance of changing the information that has been made available through the Faculty Salaries and Promotions Committee, we don't need to talk much about that, I can just initiate that action and improve the communication from that committee to the Faculty and vice versa. There is suggestion that the Dean's Advisory Committee which is made up of the department chairs become more of the steering committee, dealing with changes in the Faculty. That's another action that I can take and we don't need to discuss that a great deal. It also recommends that our Faculty Council meeting become more of the discussion forum and I think what I'll do there is to go back to something that I tried a number of years ago, that is, that we'll have the regularly scheduled faculty forum to try out different ideas.

In this sense, the Dean intended to attack one or two priority issues in every upcoming year. Then, he addressed his intention,

From my standpoint, if they [faculty members] understand that every year we will be identifying at least one issue and in that sense, they may say to me, "OK, Bob, these two that we are going to attack this year are not my priority issues," my approach to say to that is to say, "OK, out of a hundred and fifty people, I could expect, these are not going to serve everybody's needs. But you have a chance, either this year or the next year, to make your issue one that we will pay attention to." And as long as they know that, and as long as we follow through on that, then, I think people in the Faculty ought to be able to make a commitment to whichever ones that are on the table at the time, knowing that they'll have a chance to try and it convinces the Faculty that their issue ought to be the next one.

... To me, if I achieve what I think needs to be achieved here, it is to get this Faculty to understand that it can never stop this process, that it's always got to be addressing new issues because one of the reasons why we are doing this now is that for so long we haven't paid attention to these kinds of things. And it's too easy to say that we are going to do this monumental kind of thing, tire ourselves out on it, and then stop it again. I'm saying, "Let's do it gradually, let's bite off a little bit of this, and let's keep biting off more and more, so that we are always doing something constructive with respect to reshaping and renewing ourselves" ... in this planning study, one of the legitimations of it to me is not as much the emphasis on strategic planning, as this is a means of trying to encourage organizational renewal.

In planning to take these actions the Dean may have been trying to achieve some of the original objectives for initiating the Strategic Planning Project, such as stimulating changes, building commitment to the Faculty, and creating a consensus on the mission statement of the Faculty. In order to fulfill these purposes, the Dean added up some other actions he was going to take.

What I am trying to get across here is as much as a philosophy of how we are to act in a faculty, in a university. In other words, we ought to keep discussing our mission and goals. Even though we will come out with documents they will say "for the time being this is our mission statement," I hope that we keep engaging in the conversation about the mission statement, so that we will refine the changes over time.

What happens is that we put too great an emphasis upon a mission statement report and we don't put enough emphasis upon the conversations and the discussions where different and conflicting ideas are competing for place in that mission statement. What's happened in the University and what's happened in the Faculty is that in many cases we have ceased talking to one another about what we really think is important and valuable. So, if this study achieves what I've wanted it to, we will get some kind of decision on

that mission statement report, but even more importantly, we will get a process in place where the Faculty will keep talking and changing and adjusting in the years ahead.

Similarly, with our philosophy about our teacher education program, there is an important change in this approach from previous ones, because in the previous occasions we were coming with a list of courses or components of different departments that have to be included in the program. In this case, we are not coming in with those pieces already identified. We are coming in with philosophy and saying, "this is the overall approach we want to take." Now, the various departments and units can tell us how they can contribute to that philosophy in that goal.

And if the Faculty gets the idea that planning is never finished, then that would be for me one of the most important accomplishments of this undertaking, because too often they just want to get the planning done, they want to get it over with, so they can get on to what they see is the real work, while I want to convince them that part of the real work is to continue to reexamine and rethink "What it is? What should we be doing? Why you are doing it?" And we got to build into the structure of the Faculty a way to guarantee that would keep us current.

Encouraging More Involvement

It could be seen from the earlier phases, one of the principles adopted in guiding this Strategic Planning Project process was a broad involvement of Faculty members and representatives of stakeholder groups. In this final phase, the Dean still followed this principle. He noted,

... one thing that we were trying to build in across all of these was involvement of the Faculty, the University, and the people outside the University. Because the idea was that somehow the process was to help stimulate interest, activity, and change ... we provided for something in the process that made people feel a sense of ownership for those issues. I don't think we have been successful of that as I would have hoped. And so, now, when we move into this final of the four phases, the action plan, we are probably going to have to go back and try to help the rest of the Faculty understand why the mission statement and the teacher education model, why those are the two topics that we are dealing with at this stage, so we never can be content that we've got them sufficiently interested, we have to keep renewing their participation and the Faculty's participation and interests.

The Dean also mentioned that he would certainly involve the department chairs more heavily in this phase than the earlier phases, because he realized the importance of involving the department chairs in the action planning phase. As one informant recounted,

Now, if the Dean involves the department chairs and say, "Look, here is how I intend to proceed and would you take these matters up with your department council?" then, I think this would be an opportunity to facilitate the process to help this happen. But if he doesn't take that initiative, I don't think that the Report itself is going to do anything for us . . . I don't think he needs to set up a new structure. I think he should work through Faculty Council, I think he should work through the department councils. But he has got to exercise leadership.

The Dean still considered it important to involve the stakeholder groups because one of the original purposes of the Project was to enhance the image of the Faculty with the stakeholder groups. During the earlier phases, the stakeholders had provided significant input in the process. In response to the phase of action planning, one stakeholder attested:

We are extremely interested in the Project, not only in terms of the mandate of the Faculty to prepare teachers, but also as a means to dramatically affect the quality of education in the Province by improving the quality of teachers. Consequently, I would urge the Faculty to provide for substantial involvement of stakeholders in the action plan phase of the study.

Another stakeholder representative indicated,

We should be involved in the action plan, particularly as a number of the things that we do on a daily basis interface with what they want to do. I also believe that they're going to have to be cognizant of the fact that we are likely to face a shortage of teachers in this province, and we're going to have that problem to solve.

Therefore, the stakeholder groups wanted continued involvement in the phase of action plan of the Project. The Dean realized these indications and would keep involve the stakeholder groups in the action plan stage.

Examining Two Task Force Reports

As indicated earlier, the former Project Coordinator made recommendations to the Dean with respect to conducting seminars for getting feedback from the Faculty on the Task Force Reports on Mission and Goals and Teacher Education Models.

. . . I think it should be done in small groups, where people can discuss and talk with one another and then move on so they have a good chance to talk and think about it. And then finally, I don't know if there's consensus, but the general feeling can be pulled together with any kind of modifications and then brought before Faculty Council for formal approval.

The Dean responded to this,

What I have said is that my role as Dean is to make sure this Faculty continues to talk about and determine its mission and goal statement. I don't want them to think that it is my place as Dean to think one up and impose it on them, it's my obligation to get one out of them. And so, I am pleased as a Dean in a sense to be able to say, "Yes, that's a statement I can approve and endorse." But for the Faculty, that's not the important reason for them to get behind it, they too have to look at it and decide whether they can believe in it, and commit to it, because that will change their behavior and that will influence their behavior . . . here is what I think a reasonably good mission and goal statement, if the faculty as a result of discussing it and debating it, come along with another one that may not be my first choice, but if that one was the one the majority of them believe in and think we ought to do, then I'll support, so, in that sense, what I am trying to point out is that for me that process is as important or even more important than the product.

Therefore, in October of 1989, the Dean called the Faculty of Education Council meeting and examined the Report of the Task Force on Mission, Goals and Priorities. The Council was asked to consider the Mission and Goals Statements in three ways: positive features; areas of concerns; and future considerations. The following statement highlights the comments raised by the Council.

The Mission, Goals and Priorities statement links theory with practice and professionalism in the Faculty. It is geared toward the development of critical thinkers and emphasizes life long engagement, concern for reflective and critical thought, and modelling of teaching.

There is a need to distinguish between the Faculty of Education mission statement and that of the Departments. It was suggested that it would be useful for Departments to develop individual mission statements.

The statement does not recognize the mosaic in the Faculty and should include the broader scope of education ranging from children to adult learners.

The statement is long and complicated. A direct and succinct statement would be more effective.

There is a need to continue with discussion of the work in which the Faculty has been engaged in over the past couple of years, and provide direction to the activity. It was suggested that the statement could be discussed once again at Department Councils. (*Minutes of the Faculty of Education Council, October 17, 1989*).

All these observations and thoughts were considered by the Task Force members on Mission, Goals, and Priorities in their later discussion and they sought to develop a modified mission and goals statement.

In November of 1989, the Dean called another Faculty of Education Council meeting to examine the Task Force Report on Teacher Education Models. Six faculty members, one from each department, were asked to present a reaction to the Report. Most reactions were positive towards the teacher education models that this Task Force identified--Concerns Based Model and Critically Reflective Model. As a result of this Council Meeting's discussion, the intent would be to continue to work with this Task Force committee and keep these items of discussion before Council.

Expectations and Concerns for the Project's Future

Planning for action was the last but most crucial stage of the Strategic Planning Project. One faculty member expressed his feeling:

I expect the action plan. I expect everything in that action plan will be justified on the basis of one or more of the recommendations. But one of a thousand different action plans could have come out of the recommendations. And the trick now, will be to recognize which of those actions are acceptable and which ones are dangerous and try to change those. Now it's the time to get involved, not earlier. Now it's time we have to be alert and see what will come out for the action plans. Now we are getting down the important stuff.

However, as one Faculty member indicated that

in a complex organization like this one, any change you make is very, very small. Because it's a conservative kind of organization. It's difficult to change. But if you invest a lot of time and energy in planning studies and changing strategies and nothing happens at all, and then you create cynicism and dissolution.

The Dean expressed his concerns,

I have come to look at it, at the stage that we are at now, I am aware that it hasn't caught the fancy or the attention of the Faculty the way I hoped it would. And so, what we encourage now that we have a Report is going to turn out to be the most critical activity with respect to the future of the Project. Even though many people had a chance to share their views and many people have been involved, experience of the University tells me that it's not until that [the Report] actually causes them to change their behavior, that these Reports are going to have any consequences and significances. And so, what takes place in the next year as we follow up on the last document, that's really going to determine whether the Faculty wants to be different and how it wants to be different.

In response to the future of the Strategic Planning Project, one informant said,

I'd like to be optimistic, but I think that the change will be minimal and slow. Indeed, if the fiscal position of the Province changes, there may not be any additional resources such as might be required. My judgment is that the changes that will occur will be long term.

One interviewee believed that,

The Strategic Planning Project will disappear completely if there is not concerted effort by the Dean to push on specific priorities he is interested in. . . . The process has not brought us to a clear recognition that we need to move into certain specific direction . . . unless the Dean, or somebody the Dean appoints, works very hard by going back to departments and pushing very hard on specific proposals where the Strategic Planning Study might be used as a basic form of support. Unless the specific proposal is pushed at, I don't think anything will happen in the short run. . . . As a specific document, the final Report of the Strategic Planning Study won't have a lot of effect on the Faculty unless the Dean provides very direct leadership.

Even the former Project Coordinator believed "unless the top leaders within the organization really take hold of this and move it ahead, it's not going to go very far. So that's a key thing with strategic planning." He was not optimistic with the future of the Project, saying,

I spent three years of my life doing it. It wasn't a new thing for me; that's the way I operated in doing other things, too. It has, in some other organizations, been instrumental in bringing about change. The fact is, we used this same approach to bring about reorganization in Alberta Education about five years ago. They accepted our report and actually brought about those changes. As I say, we've done this with, I've just finished it, with the Trustees' organization, and I think it's going to be very influential there, but they operated differently. In a university faculty like this, in a large institution like this, I'm not as hopeful, put it that way.

One informant expressed his concern, "Now the task is to get on with the business of implementation and not to treat this plan as a blueprint: It's not the blueprint for a building, it's the first step in a continuous process of planning." He continued,

. . . because we're dealing with tremendous uncertainties, we're dealing with judgments, when you deal with strategic planning for a human organization, you should never treat it as a blueprint . . . the environment will change, the circumstances will change . . . and the danger is that you'll spend all your time for planning. It's taken three years to get here, and it'll take three years to get to the next step; in the meantime you have done nothing. That's a real risk, so one has to have action coupled with planning, so that every action that you take is then considered in the context of your total planning: How does that fit in?

One informant suggested that the action plan should be very specific. "Each of these actions should be one tiny part of each of those big, broad and general recommendations." One interviewee considered that the action plan should not be diffused in broad considerations rather than tackling specific, manageable problems. Another believed that the planning for action should "deal with it piecemeal, trying to deal with it as a whole won't work because it's too varied in its content."

Many people interviewed felt pessimistic about the future of the Strategic Planning Project because of the resource problems. They believed that the government had been cutting down the amounts of money for post-secondary education, for research and development. One informant from the Government indicated,

... in Canada and in other countries as well, the universities in general are coming under increasing scrutiny. In Alberta the scrutiny is being magnified, or the need for scrutiny is being magnified by the continuing demands for more money, but I think that as that pressure mounts, that governments are going to have to look at those institutions they call universities that they are funding and looking at the productivity side: What are they producing? What return are we getting for that tremendous investment in post-secondary education, university education? I don't think we can simply continue to accede to demands without knowing what it is that they're really doing in those institutions.

One Faculty member noted, "our resources are going to dwindle some more, we know that. Alberta is in bad shape economically, no doubt about it. I think that worries about resources, which are always with us but serious concerns, will divert us from whatever the Report might have done." Because of the financial retrenchment, one informant was concerned that: "what tends to happen in organizations especially like ours, when things like that come about, the new things and the innovative things are the first to go, and people retain the old standard things."

Some people interviewed felt negative about what would happen to the Strategic Planning Project. One said, "I'm fearful that it will be like any other Royal Commission, and all it will do is sit on a shelf somewhere and gather dust, and no one will take any action on it. ... The biggest concern is, how are they going to gain some sort of faculty

consensus that as a faculty they will do something?" One interviewee explained his perspective: "the problem with any planning activity, is it just a tempest in a teapot to keep everybody sort of in abeyance whilst the plan is being planned? And then nothing will come of it, and in a few years you start another plan? Meanwhile, the dinosaur keeps moving on in its slow fashion." One informant put it succinctly: "I suspected some actions will be taken, but I don't think that any of that will be revolutionary. I think that is a kind of new bottle and old wine." Another expressed his feeling that "the priorities as indicated in the document will indicate to us more of the same, more continuing on in the old road we are going where the undergraduate program is the primary and most important area that we will look at."

One Faculty member interviewed believed that things were going to be changing in the departments. However, he explained, "I don't think we can credit this document as being the thing that stimulated that discussion or that helped us to identify those changes we are to make." Another faculty member believed the real changes were dependent upon the Dean's will, he said,

Adult Education is going to grow here, because the Dean wants it to grow. The Dean believes it is an important area, whether the rest of us believe it or not is probably not very important. ITC will continue to grow because the Dean wants it to grow. It has no academic component. That has been now removed. Vocational and Industrial Education will become the Adult Career and Technology, because the Dean wants it to become. And there have been some payoffs, not illegal payoff, but you scratch my back and I scratch your back that have not come to the surface by some of the administrators.

Since the final phase--action planning was just in progress, this section could only conclude with the expectations, concerns, and anticipated outcomes of the Project.

Summary

This chapter, together with Chapter IV, has completed the description of the whole process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. Chapter IV addresses the

first two research questions related to the reasons for initiating this Project, the design, and the organizational structure of the Project. This chapter focuses on the last research question with regard to the nature of the approaches and procedures employed in the process of the Project, the involvements of the Project participants, and the procedural and anticipated outcomes resulted from the process. The next chapter contains a reflection on the major themes and issues which emerged from the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project in relation to the literature on strategic planning.

CHAPTER VI

REFLECTIONS IN RELATION TO THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter four issues which are the major themes to emerge from the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project and their relationship to the literature on strategic planning are explored.

According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982, p. 173), a theme is some concept or theory that emerges from your data: "some signal trend, some master conception, or key distinction." (Mills, 1959, p. 216) "Themes are like stars that make up the universes of meaning we live through. It is by the light of these themes that we navigate and explore such universes." (Van Manen, 1984, p. 59)

Four major themes--(1) Model, (2) Leadership, (3) Involvement, and (4) Culture--have been identified for reflection and interpretation. These four themes stated as issues provide the foci of the description of the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project in Chapters IV and V.

Model: Strategic Planning versus Traditional Planning

In this section the major differences between the general strategic planning model in the related literature and the model of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project are compared. From this comparison, whether the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project followed a strategic planning model or a traditional planning model can be decided.

Most of the writers on strategic planning advocate strongly that environmental scanning is the major element that distinguishes strategic planning from traditional

planning. Although traditional planning may take a perfunctory glance at the external environment, its starting point is usually internal--the existing statements of goals and objectives. Strategic planning differs from this approach by its conscious, searching attention to environmental factors. From these it identifies "threats and opportunities" and links them to organizational "strengths and weaknesses". The overall objective of strategic planning is to make the most of current or anticipated environmental conditions while capitalizing on organizational opportunities and narrowing constraints to arrive at an optimum, feasible match between internal capabilities and external environmental conditions.

Morrison and Associates (1983) indicate that success in strategic planning depends heavily upon having an adequate and effective means of identifying what is likely to happen in the external environment and in forecasting how these events may affect the institution (pp. 15-29). This is the focus of environmental scanning. Verstegen and Wagoner (1989) point out that environmental scanning is the process that seeks information about events and relationships in the outside environment, the knowledge of which would assist top management in its task of charting the future course of action. It is the radar screen where random signals are registered and are then analyzed for possible pattern formulation (p. 37). Jonsen (1986) believes that institutions of higher education perennially swim in this environmental sea of external circumstances. He identifies six primary aspects of this environment: the demographic environment, the economic environment, the political environment, the organizational environment, the technological environment, and the social and cultural environment (p. 6). These environmental elements have always pressed in on institutions of higher education, requiring their leaders to be alert and responsive.

The Dean of the Faculty of Education referred to some of the political, economic, social, technological, and demographic environmental pressures upon the Faculty and these factors became some of the impetus to establish the Strategic Planning Project, as discussed at the beginning section of Chapter IV.

As described earlier, in Phase 1: Internal Audit and Environmental Examination, two studies, the Faculty Current Status and Trends Study and A Review of Literature on Teacher Education, were conducted. The former described the Faculty's purposes, programs, characteristics of students, resources, organization, relationships with external units, and achievements. It focused on the internal audit. The latter examined some of the external environmental factors to faculties of education in general, especially in teacher education, which focused on the societal and demographic mega-trends and on teacher education reform in English-speaking countries.

It is obvious that a thorough examination of environmental conditions for the Faculty through these two studies was inadequate. As one informant from stakeholder groups pointed out, "I think they considered the environmental constraints, the environmental context in which they functioned. But in the final analysis it was more self-serving than environment-serving . . . the final outcome was looking more at the Faculty itself and its maintenance than accommodating the environment demands." One Faculty member perceived "the internal review in this Faculty has been well done," but the examination of environmental conditions was not thoroughly done. He referred to Bryson (1988) that environmental scanning should be done in political, economic, social and technological environments, called PEST. Political environment of the Faculty, for instance, should include political factors inside and outside the University. Political factors outside the University at least should include the Alberta Department of Education, Department of Advanced Education, Alberta Teachers' Association, Alberta School Trustees' Association, local school systems, and other political forces around the Faculty. One faculty member added,

As a faculty, I think we spent a lot more time looking at things internally than we did looking externally . . . if we were doing things in relation to our environment . . . did we go out and pull together people out of industry? Did we go out and pull selected parental groups? Did we go out and really interact with community leagues in Edmonton? Did we go out and interact with various other sectors of the business world?

I can bet, oil and gas, tourism, agriculture are the three big business areas of this province. Did we go out and systematically contact that economic environment which our teachers were teaching children to function in? Did we go out and contact that tourism industry which was growing significantly in this province and talk with various sectors of that industry in regards to what they saw as the needs that kids should be exposed to through the teachers that we train? And did we go out to competent people and say, "You are a competent person. [We've selected a hundred competent Albertans that we have targeted], and we want to get your input as to what you think teachers should have for the year 2000?"

It was perceived that the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project did not cover all these aspects in terms of its environmental examination. However, it did contact the stakeholder groups by interviewing them and ask their representatives to sit on the Panel to help the Faculty examine and identify the major problems or issues facing the Faculty. There is no doubt that this process could be considered as the internal audit, but not as the examination of the external environments around the Faculty, because their focus was inward, not outward.

According to one informant's perception,

what we really did is go through some issues . . . we've created issues from our perspective from within the Faculty, and many teacher educators went through a process of going to school for twelve years, decided on teacher education and went to university for four years, they did a Master's degree, and then somewhere between their Master's degree and completing a Ph.D. or after they completed a Ph.D., they entered teacher education, and then they taught other teachers, and the cycle repeated itself. So the vast majority of people who are training teachers have only had an education experience; they haven't had a broader experience.

He further commented,

Those are the people that we have relied on to provide us with the information, primarily, in terms of our planning process. The mission statement, for example, was created by people in the Faculty, and if they went externally to other groups--they tended to go primarily to groups in the field of education--yet education serves all of society, and I think if they were to have made use of the true benefits of strategic planning, they would have emphasized a broader reaching out and a narrower focus internally, maybe with the same amount of involvement internally--they might have been involved more with external groups that were sharing their perspectives.

Then, he concluded that it was when,

I went through the other documents that had documented the process, that I found a lopsided kind of an involvement in terms of much more time and

activity spent by members of our own faculty than by members of society out there at large in terms of our time. . . . My feeling was that we were being too introspective; we were being too internal in our thinking in terms of strategic planning, and that's why I say that I really think the label [Strategic Planning Project] was an inappropriate label . . . and maybe we have done very little in terms of strategic planning in reality. We've done a lot of issues clarification internally within the profession of teacher education.

Another informant expressed his concern on the insufficient environmental examination,

if you haven't done this first phase [Internal Audit and Environmental Examination] thoroughly, then the issue identification in the second phase, will identify issues primarily based on the feelings of people within [the Faculty]. And so, there will be a distortion of phase two based on the too narrow view taken from phase one. Then the alternatives for solution are going to suffer the same problem.

Strategic planning has been adopted in higher educational institutions for no longer than a decade, especially in Canadian colleges and universities. Many chief administrators in higher educational institutions who tried to adopt strategic planning were often enmeshed by the concepts of rational planned change (Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Chaffee, 1985a).

Winstead (1982) provided the following definition of rational planned change:

Planned change is a deliberate process designed to solve a problem or improve a condition. It is based on objective research, formal interventions, and the use of systematic planning procedures. It is designed to alleviate fear and uncertainty and to foster excitement, institutional renewal, and personal and organizational growth (p. 30).

Nadler and Bozeman (1983) summarize the basics of conventional approaches to planned change as (1) define the problem; (2) formulate the problem; (3) explore alternatives; (4) select solution; (5) detail the solution; and (6) implement the solution (p. 526).

The theory of planned change provides a foundation for the renewal processes in higher educational institutions. Small et al. (1976) define institutional renewal as a process whereby an institution ascertains its current conditions, identifies the discrepancies between what is and what ought to be, and directs its activities toward the achievement of its desired state (p. 2). They described the process of institutional renewal as four stages: (1) taking stock of current conditions, (2) identifying areas for change, (3) development of alternative solutions for bringing about desired changes, and (4) taking action. They also pointed out

Because of the process of institutional renewal is iterative in nature, one must assume that, after an appropriate period of time, the institution will endeavor to evaluate the results of changes or "take stock" of the new, current conditions and begin the process over again. Thus institutional renewal is an on-going process consistent with the notion of planned change (p. 2).

In essence, planned change, according to Cameron (1984), is often called Organization Development (OD) which focuses on changes motivated from within the organization and is generally oriented toward changes in individual attitudes and behaviors and in the organizational culture (p. 123). From focuses to procedures, it was perceived that the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project followed a planned change model.

As indicated in earlier chapters, the initiation of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was an adaptation to the PACCR Study. Six departments of the Faculty of Education had undergone the PACCR Study before the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was started. The main objective of the PACCR Study was to initiate renewal and improvement for a specific department through its self examination. The researcher studied the model and process of the PACCR Study in order to identify the differences between the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project and the PACCR Study.

The PACCR process started with a department self-study. People within the department identified their own strengths and weaknesses, problems and issues, looked at the way in which they had operated in the past, and tried to project what they should do in the future. This had been done in a reasonable-sized unit, a department which was small enough so that it had unanimity or consensus on the focus of its activities. Then, after they had done the self-study, they established a review committee--an external review team including some experts from outside and an expert from inside the University who didn't know anything about the discipline, but who was a scholar and knowledgeable in some other aspect of the academic community. These people came to look at what was going on in the department that was under review. They started with the self-study report which gave them the basis of some of the characteristics of this department and what they should

look at. They came in and talked to people who were involved and people from outside the department who were knowledgeable about the process. Based upon the self-study report and their interviews, they formulated some specific and focused recommendations so that people could consider them and work out a plan for implementing them. Some of the recommendations could be implemented immediately if the department agreed that these were things that they should do. Other things, like some of the longer-term developments of curriculum and research projects might take years to achieve.

Given the similarities between them, the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was deep-rooted in the PACCR Study. It was hard to tell the differences in terms of the procedures and approaches employed by these two studies. The only difference was the scope of the self-study in the former dealt with departmental level issues and the latter addressed the Faculty-wide issues which clearly transcended the individual departments. As indicated earlier, motivated by the PACCR Study, the Dean established the Strategic Planning Project to fill in the gaps between the department self-studies (PACCR) and to develop a comprehensive picture of the Faculty in operation. There is no doubt that the PACCR model belongs to the model of organizational development or organizational renewal; it was an planned change model. The model of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, therefore, should be considered as the same as the PACCR Study. As one Project Coordinator pointed out

We spent a lot of time focusing on issues and how you go about trying to resolve issues. That's not all from the strategic planning; there's a mix in here. A lot of it comes from the concept of change--change theory--which, again, is a big part of my background. So there is a lot more of the stuff coming out of change literature in this than you might find in some strategic planning studies.

One informant referred to the model that the Coordinator employed in the Project as basically coming from organization development,

It isn't a management model as such, nor is it a higher education model. But it's a planned change model that comes out of Organization Development theory, and that's a field linked to behavioral science. I think it [strategic planning] was just a nice-sounding word.

Another Coordinator pointed out that the change from "Faculty Self Study" to "Strategic Planning Project" really didn't mean a lot. "It didn't change any of the things that we were going to do or anything; it was just putting a label on it that was more consistent with the recent literature."

Faculty members interviewed reflected differently upon the title of the Strategic Planning Project. One informant felt strongly that using the word "strategic" was not appropriate. There was not much to do with strategy. It was a way of attempting to create some consensus, to get people to understand each other, and to build a Faculty oriented community. Another informant thought "It's merely a planning project. Calling it "strategic" is in vogue, a current buzzword in the management literature and to some extent in the education literature." Therefore, one informant concluded that

strategic planning is a powerful thing, and a faculty self review is not; it's a negative kind of thing in many ways: "We're going to review the Faculty." "We're going to conduct strategic planning for the future." Which of those is most powerful? "We're going to review the Faculty, review something"; you look over the past. When you're doing strategic planning, you're trying to work into the future, and in my mind there was a conflict there in that the Dean was coming from a self review.

Actually, the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project originated from a self review. Issue identification was the major focus of the Project. However, issues management shouldn't be confused with strategic planning. Most of the time, issues management could be the early stage of the process of strategic planning, but only if the strategic issues were really identified based on the environmental scanning and internal audit. The key things here are strategic issues and environmental scanning. Issues management is defined by Lozier and Chittipeddi (1986) as:

an ongoing organizational process concerned with the identification of issues that may impact on the strategic directions of the organization, the analysis of these issues to establish their relevance to the organization and the likelihood of their occurrence, and the development of appropriate organizational responses to these issues.

This definition implies that there are several stages in the issues management process:

(1) scanning the external environment to identify strategic issues; (2) analyzing these issues for their likely impact and probability of occurrence; and (3) developing suitable responses for managing the issues.

Ashley (1983) defined a strategic issue as an external development which could impact the organization's performance; to which the organization must respond in an orderly fashion; over which the organization might reasonably expect to exert some influence (p. 11). Freeman (1984) pointed out that,

The key to success for issue management . . . must be its ability to surface and track real issues that affect the strategic direction of the corporation or business unit. The usefulness of the issues management process stems from its potential to act as an early detector of significant external trends, and to provide the mechanisms for developing effective strategies to respond to those trends. (p. 221)

Issues management "affects both the process and content of subsequent phases of strategic decision making" (Dutton, 1983, p. 308).

The model which came out of the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project seemed to deal with issues. But to a certain degree, the process was more inward looking than outward looking, more negatively than positively focussed. And that relates to the nature of the university academia: in search of knowledge or in search of truth, the faculty tend to take a critical eye. "Members of the Faculty tend to 'look inward' rather than seeking out external relationships as they once did" (McIntosh, 1986, p. 86).

However, in the strategic planning models used in business or even in higher education, the labels were more positive--they talked about "threats and opportunities," "weaknesses and strengths" with regard to internal audit and external examination. That's where a strategic planner, a professional strategic planner might have done more optimistic things.

The labels used in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project: selection of issues, consideration of issues, and issues identification were more backward looking than forward looking. They are good labels for the process of conducting a self-review. This is

key in deciding whether the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project is a planned change model or a strategic planning practice.

A content analysis of the documents of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project uncovered that the word "strategic" was seldom used except in the title of the Project. If one pulled "strategic planning" out of the title, and put in "Issues Clarification" there, "Faculty of Education Issues Clarification Project" would be a more appropriate label.

The process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was created to move people within the Faculty towards institutional renewal, to develop a consensus on the vision of the Faculty. Whether or not it was planning strategically was not really important. The direction that education proceeds in the Province strategically is under the power of the provincial government. It is the government that provides the strategic direction in terms of where higher education should be going, because they control the budget. The Faculty does not have much control over the funding.

The question that could be asked is, "Is it really viable for a faculty which basically reacts to requirements for training teaching professionals within an environment that is strategically directed by the provincial government to do strategic planning?" The Faculty certainly can look at itself from a program standpoint, such as graduate, undergraduate programs, and so on, and do an internal review within the Faculty, and try something different for the future. This leads back to the question, "Are they doing a Faculty review, or are they doing a strategic planning study?" Based on the process used, it would seem that they have done more for a faculty review around classical or emerging issues than they have done strategic planning.

The proof of that will be when they get into the action planning: Are their actions strategic, or are their actions responses to particular issues? If one takes a single issue, for example, "What emerging models or frameworks for organizing teacher preparation programs should be considered for adoption?"--are they looking at that from the standpoint

of an action that creates a new framework, saying, "We have discovered, through this strategic planning process, that we need to restructure our Faculty so that, instead of spending three quarters to seven eighths of our program in courses, and one eighth of our program in practicum, strategically, in terms of preparing teachers in that environment out there, we should have fifty percent in course work, conceptual understandings, and fifty percent in practicum." That's a very different kind of strategy for preparing teachers. Or does their action just say, "We've identified these two or three frameworks, and we'll have to think about that for the future." What that will have done is to create a process for people to do some reflecting and thinking upon what they have done in a collective way, but strategically, they will not advance themselves significantly, and only the action plan will prove that.

However, as Lozier and Chittipeddi (1986) indicate, the strength of issues identification lies in its ability to get at issues that transcend traditional organizational boundaries, or at issues that necessitate cross-unit strategies (p. 7). Just as one informant reflected upon the issue identification of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project:

I personally think that this sort of activity is important. Otherwise, procedures are used, like the Faculty Council and the Department Councils, they're all procedures for concerns to be identified and to be pursued through the normal administrative procedures of the Faculty. But those procedures rarely address issues that transcend local constituencies . . . so the formal organization doesn't seem to be particularly sensitive to things like mission statements or other sorts of themes that go across any department. So something like this [the issue identification], because it allows those deeper, as well as broader, issues to receive occasion for talk [is important].

Another informant noted,

I think the process certainly did arouse the interests of people in the Faculty in some of the issues that confront the teacher education program, as people tend to work mostly in their own areas and sometimes we don't think generally enough about broad issues that are confronting the Faculty. And the strategic planning project certainly did arouse that interest, so as far as helping to define and clarify what those issues are and drawing our attention to them.

It is obvious that the technology, the products, and the traditions of universities make it necessary to preserve the traditional disciplinary structure, with very limited recourse to reorganization. The issues identification process is a good means of preserving the traditional structure of universities while imbuing them with the advantages of cross-organizational or cross-unit planning.

Organization is viewed by Pfeffer (1982) as context in which people, problems, and solutions come together, with the results determined importantly by the process and constraints on that process. He also views the organization as a system of shared meaning, in which of the organizational work consists of symbol manipulation and the development of a shared organizational paradigm (p. 9). Morgan (1980) considers that much of human understanding in the organization occurs through symbolic processes. In Chaffee's (1985b) interpretive strategy model, symbols and communication are the tools with which organizational participants create, reiterate, alter, circumscribe, and interpret their interactions and their sense of satisfaction.

Issues identification conveys to the members of the organization a clear message that they should be attentive to these issues, and that these issues reflect the values and the direction of the organization. The issues identification process also has implication for the political dynamics within the organization. According to Pfeffer (1981), "moving of formerly ignored issues onto the decision agenda permits the possible development of coalitions and political bargaining with groups that might be interested in the new issues" (p. 147). Therefore, issue identification has a symbolic function which can make changes in individual attitudes and values which relate to the organizational culture.

In the above section, the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was compared with strategic planning models and traditional planning models, such as institutional renewal and organizational development. This analysis revealed that the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was "strategic planning" in title, but

traditional planning in practice, because of its inward focus, inadequate environmental scanning, and a lack of identification of strategic issues.

Leadership: Aspiration versus Actuality

In the following section, the Dean's aspirations, dreams, commitment, and leadership style in carrying out the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project are discussed. On the other hand, dilemmas, constraints, and realities faced by the Dean are also outlined.

Writers on strategic planning all consider that the full commitment of the top administrators is the most important and essential factor to make successful and effective strategic planning. Steiner (1979a) discusses this at some length. A brief review of his statement is provided below.

Before trying to do strategic planning, the chief administrators must have a clear understanding of what it is all about. Proper delegation is not likely without it. Proper delegation can be based only on a clear perception of the purposes and methods of strategic planning, a well-balanced assignment of roles among administrators and staff, a careful identification of the procedures appropriate to the organization, and a thorough grasp of the types of skills needed to do effective planning.

The chief administrators must give strategic planning firm support and make sure that others in the organization understand their depth of commitment. Strategic planning is of the highest importance in the effective discharge of many of their duties.

The chief administrators must (a) make sure that the climate for effective strategic planning is established and maintained; (b) get involved in the strategic planning and do the job; and (c) make all key decisions, with appropriate staff and organizational support.

The chief administrators should meet face to face with people who are in charge of the strategic planning to discuss the plans they have prepared, so they will be much better

informed of the plans and will have a better basis for accepting, rejecting, or modifying them. Also, the people in charge will understand clearly the interest and commitment of the chief administrators (pp. 80-94).

Later, Lorange (1982) summarizes the key aspects to which top administrators should commit to designing and operating strategic planning:

1. To develop throughout the organization an understanding of what strategic planning really is, how it is to be done in the organization, and the degree of commitment of top leadership to doing it well.
2. To accept and balance interrelationships among intuition, judgment, values, and the formality of the planning system.
3. To encourage line administrators to do effective strategic planning by basing performance appraisal and rewards solely on short-range performance measures.
4. To tailor and design the strategic planning system to the unique characteristics of the organization and its administration.
5. To spend sufficient time on the strategic planning process so that the process becomes credited among other administrators and staff.
6. To modify the strategic planning system as conditions within the organization change.
7. To mesh properly the process of administration and strategic planning from the highest levels of administration and planning through operational planning and its complete implementation.
8. To keep the planning system simple and to weigh constantly the cost-benefit balance.
9. To secure within the organization a climate for strategic planning that is necessary for its success.
10. To balance and link appropriately the major elements of the strategic planning and implementation process (pp. 39-40).

Gluck (1975) concludes, since strategic planning is action oriented, the responsibility for it rests solely with the leaders of an organization unit, not the staff. The "doer" is the "planner". Planning is a function that top leaders can ill afford to delegate (pp. 11-13).

The Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, however, was perceived by one faculty member as "strictly a vehicle for the Dean to implement the ideas he has in mind that he hasn't rationalized openly himself. . . . I believe he has a plan as to how he wants to mould this Faculty and I believe he should put those cards on the table, so that they can be more openly discussed." Although this point of view was not supported by people who were close to the actual carrying out of the Project, there was no doubt that the understanding of the Project throughout the Faculty was not properly developed.

However, the Dean contended that his intention for initiating the Project was to get the faculty to make their own decisions, trying to show to them that he was open to their inputs, their discussions, and their decision making. Once he put the Project Team in place, he had never influenced the decisions made by the Project Team. One Project Coordinator indicated that the Dean gave his blessing on all of the decision-making of the Project and never interfered. The Project Team at times had the Dean act as front man, so faculty members could understand the Dean's support and commitment to the Project. One informant perceived that the Dean initiated the process, approved the original Project Proposal, set up the Project structure, and then deliberately stood back from the planning process and let the Project Team proceed without intervention. Another informant speculated that the Dean tried to stay distant from the Project because of political concerns within the Faculty. One respondent did not remember whether the Dean had ever talked in public about the strategic planning process for the past three years. He strongly contended

If I were the Dean, I would be constantly, in any communication I sent out, in any speech I would be making, I would be continuously making reference to the strategic planning process to make sure that was constantly in the consciousness of everybody. If I wrote a letter to the Folio [University Newsletter], if I gave a public presentation outside the University, strategic planning would be always mentioned. That would be just one little strategy for making sure that it was in everybody's agenda.

This viewpoint is in agreement with Simerly's ideas. Simerly (1987) indicates that for strategic planning to succeed, the top administrators must make it clear through written communication, as well as through verbal and nonverbal communication, that such a plan is one of the priorities in the organization. The top administrators must be willing to reinforce this on a daily basis through routine interactions with people as well as through special meetings devoted to strategic planning. If they are not willing to do this, it would be better not to try to carry out strategic planning throughout the whole organization (p. 23).

One informant commented that the Strategic Planning Project had not been conducted as a continuous and ongoing process that was always in the consciousness of everyone. He contended that the Dean should constantly conduct a certain amount of propaganda of the concept of the strategic planning and try to sell the ideas to the Faculty and develop a vision for the Faculty.

However, the Dean was widely perceived as not willing to sell the ideas of strategic planning to Faculty members and to impose a vision on the Faculty, because he was a philosopher and an historian, not a salesman. One respondent commented upon the Dean's background which influenced his leadership style:

look at the nature of the people providing leadership . . . and given the Dean being a significant factor that he was previously a Department Head of Educational Foundations here in the Faculty, and a historian himself, that orientation [of the Project] doesn't surprise me . . . they've got into trying to get clarification and some resolution around these issues.

One informant indicated that the Dean was widely referred to by the Faculty members as "Our Philosopher Dean." He speculated that the Dean had a conflict whether to do a strategic planning or to do a faculty self review. He noted,

he'd conducted the review there as Chairman and been involved with it; he understood that. He didn't understand strategic planning . . . I think there was an assumption made that we could very easily convert our review processes, as academics reviewed an academic unit, we could convert those processes into strategic planning, and by calling it "strategic planning," we'd be doing strategic planning. I think that created a weakness, and I

think it created a reason why the Dean did not sell the idea, because in his mind he was talking about a review.

The Dean indicated that he was not an expert on strategic planning, "while I used the title of strategic planning, I really don't know all of the ingredients of strategic planning. I am going to use it in a much more pragmatic way than the experts in strategic planning would use it." He continued, "I am going to pick some elements out of strategic planning and then I may pick some elements from other themes as well, because my ultimate goal is organizational renewal."

In one faculty member's words, "Dean Patterson was thinking in terms of a faculty review, I'm absolutely convinced that that was the words that he related to." And he added, "I think somebody else sold him the idea of strategic planning, and I don't think that he was that comfortable with the terminology, and I don't think he sold it to the Faculty as hard as he could have." One Project Coordinator was convinced that

This project was not really set up from the Dean's perspective to start with as a strategic planning approach, because the term, he may have heard of it, but he wasn't really acquainted with that too much. So this project really was a project to develop a strategic planning approach, and to look at this way: originally, it was a project just to review [the Faculty]. . . .

With regard to the model followed by the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, the Dean noted that he had learnt from his own experience working in the Faculty. What he was doing this time was not what he did last time.

As Smith (1987) points out, many research findings show that most top administrators rely very heavily on their past experiences in evolving their strategies. Many who move from one job to another simply put into effect the same strategy in each case, only embellished and expanded each time to take account of the new circumstances in which they find themselves. Additionally it also seems quite rare for top managers to evolve significant new strategies while they are in "the hot seat", probably because the energy required to implement the existing strategy makes it hard for them to stand back and reconsider the overall patterns with which they are faced.

Therefore, by summarizing all factors mentioned above, it is to conclude that the Dean was trying to adapt, not adopt the pragmatic, current, and democratic term "strategic planning" and to carry out a Faculty self review which was deeply-rooted in his past experience.

However, strategic planning needs vision oriented symbolic leadership. Steeples (1988) indicates that "the foundation of all strategic planning lies in the development of a specific vision for an institution. This vision must comprehend the entire institution" (p. 100). The foremost responsibility of the top leadership is to have, to understand, to articulate, and to inspire with zeal, a vision of what the institution is becoming and to provide the structure for accomplishing it. Understanding the vision means knowing its decision-making implications in all settings. Articulating the vision means broadcasting to all other decision makers the relevant decision criteria. Finally, inspiring suggests moving people throughout the organization to expend energy, wisdom, and ingenuity toward achieving the vision (Brown, 1988, p. 24).

Clearly, the Dean did not attempt to impose a vision on the Faculty when he started the Project, nevertheless, he intended to use the process of the Project to guide the faculty members to develop their vision and the mission of the Faculty. Actually, the mission statement is an important element of strategic planning and a rationale which describes the organization's purpose and objectives. Once formulated, it becomes a cornerstone for the remaining strategic planning elements and activities.

As described earlier, the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project had been carried out in four phases: (1) Internal Audit and Environmental Examination, (2) Issue Identification, (3) Generation of Alternatives for Issue Resolution, and (4) Development of an Action Plan. Going back to the literature, Verstegen and Wagoner (1989) summarize the main process of many strategic planning models as follows:

- (1) the mission and goal statements are formulated and provide "targets" toward which strategies are aimed;

- (2) an environmental scan is developed through specification of current and existing factors and conditions that must be taken into account when formulating the organization's strategies;
- (3) an internal profile and resource audit are conducted to catalogue and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the organization;
- (4) the formulation, evaluation, and selection of strategies take place based upon the organization's objectives, goals, the environmental scan and internal profile; and finally
- (5) the implementation and control of the strategic plan occurs (pp. 36-7).

In comparison with the model of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, the mission statement formulation was not the first step. Instead, the Project started with an internal audit and environmental examination as the first step. On the other hand, instead of being strategy focused, it focused on issue identification. The focused issues identified in Phase 3 of the process include the articulation of a mission statement, a general vision of the Faculty. It is understood that the Dean could not impose a mission statement at the beginning of the Project because the Faculty of Education,

quite unlike other University faculties, including the other professional schools--is at the center of a web of conflicting expectations. The University is tugging in one direction: with its increasing focus on high-quality graduate research which is recognized internationally, the University clearly expects the Faculty to support research and development. At the same time, the University expects the Faculty to provide cost-efficient undergraduate education. The provincial government and the teaching profession are tugging in different directions: with their focus on provincial concerns, they place major importance on having the Faculty prepare certified teachers and, to a lesser extent, other professionals in the fields of counselling, psychology, special education, and administration. In addition, the government and the profession are more interested in applied research which is of direct benefit to decision makers and expect the Faculty to participate in community and professional services such as conferences, in-services, and committee work. (McIntosh, 1987, p. 7)

Furthermore, as Cope (1981) argues, strategic planning models in higher education are and should be even more unique because the constraints operating on education policy-making and decision-making are unique. For instance: (1) politics may dominate policy;

(2) decision making is incremental; (3) latitude in policy is narrow; (4) policy consistency is broader and more involved; (5) lines of authority are not clearly defined; and (6) participative decision making is the norm (p. 19). Facing these political influences and contextual constraints, the Dean had a dilemma whether to set up the mission statement for the Faculty at the first stage of its Strategic Planning Project or to develop a commonly held mission through the process of the Strategic Planning Project. This was the first dilemma facing the Dean.

The second dilemma that the Dean faced was whether he could link the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project with financial planning of the Faculty. As mentioned in Chapter IV, one of the reasons of the initiation of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was financial pressures--declining in funding and staffing with thirty-three faculty members retired, the Dean wanted to use this Project to set priorities, mission and goals to use the resources most wisely. However, after four years, the mission and priorities had still not been formulated.

According to Lisensky (1988), budget is the crucial control system, so it is critically important that the budget be integrated into the strategic planning process. Resource allocation is one of the most powerful of administration's management tools. Spending authorizations provide incentives for change in desired directions. They are the mechanism for translating plans into action, for channeling resources toward the accomplishment of goals. Budget, in most universities, is a process of making incremental adjustments up or down from the previous year's allocation. The funding base is defined in terms of financial precedents rather than in terms of programmatic aims or priorities. In order to link strategic planning with budget, administrators must find a method to transcend the annual budget cycle, with its tendency to perpetuate what is rather than to explore and elaborate what ought to be (p. 18).

Therefore, a vital--but at the same time difficult--task in strategic planning is to link systematically the budget process to the goals and action plans developed. Tying the

aspirations of the institution to the constraints of the budget forces the administrators to set priorities and to be realistic about what can be accomplished.

However, since the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project had not set up mission, goals, and priorities, it is obviously difficult, if not impossible to link the budget with this Strategic Planning Project. Just as one informant contended

if it [the process of the Project] ends up with developing consensus about what our highest priorities are . . . only then can the administration get support for channelling resources into those top priorities and taking resources away from lower priorities . . . and I think, when you [the Dean] start this process, unless you're really committed to setting priorities at the end and to investing resources heavily in your highest priorities, then you'd better not start the process in the first place.

However, from the researcher's point of view, even if the priorities were set up, funding the planning is not a simple matter of funding the first priority completely, then moving to the second priority, and so forth. In fact, institutions fund a mixture of priorities to varying degrees, depending on conditions at the time funds are allocated. Conditions inevitably change between the time that planning is established and resources are allocated. Changing conditions always lead to changes in priorities. Therefore, linking financial planning with the Strategic Planning Project was a great dilemma facing the Dean. One Coordinator explained that the budget operation in the Faculty was too complex. It was based on how much the Faculty got last year, not on the programs; so it was difficult to include budgetary planning in the Project.

Actually, planning and budgeting in universities often function on different schedules. Budgets are established on the basis of a fiscal year and on the specific events that happen during that fiscal year. Budget schedules are difficult to change because institutional operations might be disrupted otherwise. The schedule for planning, which by its nature tends to focus on the longer time horizon, is inherently more flexible. Much of the budgeting occurs within a framework of one or two years. However, for planning, it is not unusual to look from one to five or even ten years into the future. Planning always tends to identify a progression of steps with less attention to specifying the particular

budget cycle in which the planning action must happen. Another major aspect is that planning is divergent thinking. Before arriving at an action plan, administrators often explore the full range of alternatives or directions for programs and activities. Budgeting, on the other hand, is a process almost driven by convergent thinking. Therefore, it is difficult for the chief administrators to diverge on their action plan at the same time as they converge on their financial plan.

As a consequence, the relationship between planning and budgeting is complex and often indirect. In addition, there are a number of limitations on the effectiveness of institutional planning, such as the uncertainty of future conditions and difficulties in predicting opportunities and threats; the politics of institutional decision making; the distribution of powers in institutions; and the time and costs required for comprehensive institutional planning.

The third dilemma that the Dean faced was how to keep the balance of top-down and bottom-up approaches in the decision-making process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. Sapp (1987) pointed out that one of the important experiences in conducting strategic planning in universities was that the plan would have credibility only if it had the strong endorsement and leadership of the person at the top. He also found that a simultaneous bottom-up and top-down approach to planning was effective. The bottom-up process was necessary not only to get the input from the faculty and line officers into the system, but also to produce a sense of ownership of the plan. A top-down approach was important, however, in order to set priorities that would assure the success of the whole institution. And these top-down decisions should be bold, not timid (p.11). Shirley (1988) also indicates

Strategic planning must be strongly decision-oriented if it is to succeed. When the hard issues are avoided, planning efforts quickly lose credibility; thus a strong commitment to make decisions must precede the planning process. . . . This commitment is essential to the future health of the campus as well as to the morale of participants in planning (pp. 12-3).

Lozier and Chittipeddi (1986) contend in the same way,

[e]ffective planning is highly dependent on effective leadership. There is a strong relationship between the quality of leadership and the ability to reach decisions regarding priorities and strategies. In the absence of decisions, there is no payoff from strategic planning; without leadership, decisions are not as likely to be forthcoming (p. 13).

However, universities are different from business institutions. Power is shared among the board, senior administrators, and the faculty, even students in some cases. Universities exist not to make profits: their central mission is to free individuals, faculty and students, to learn. Their "product" is ideas, which are impossible to quantify and measure. The intellectual individualism that is central to a university's existence is seemingly at odds with centralized planning (Foote, 1988, pp. 80-81).

Facing the same kind of situation or dilemma, the Dean explained his leadership in operating the Strategic Planning Project. He was facing "a tricky kind of issue", that is, how to keep balance and harmony between top-down and bottom-up approaches in leading the process of the Project. If the Dean was heavy-handed with the Project, people would consider him to be too authoritarian. If decision-making only depended on the bottom-up approach, then it was too diffuse and difficult to achieve consensus among the faculty. The Dean described his dilemma in carrying out the Strategic Planning Project in the Faculty:

Because the university model is built so much on the democratic process, that is grassroots ideas, that if you don't have a consensus or majority opinion among the participants, then, no leader is going to be able to require them [the Faculty] to do something.

Most of the models you found in business, in fact, I saw one just on the weekend where somebody was showing me a tape of how a new executive, a new CEO in Scandinavian Airlines had an approach that in one year turned the company around from an 8 million dollars loss to a multi-million dollars gain, and his approach had been "we are going to be service-oriented, we are going to find ways to improve the quality of our services to our clients." And he met directly with many of the people. He bypassed his middle management which was an offensive thing to some of them, but by going directly to the people and taking that leadership role, they achieved that turnaround in a very short period of time.

I can try to be involved in that same way through this study. But if I can't persuade, if I can't somehow reason with the Faculty to get them to endorse it, I can't impose it whereas that man has the power and authority to say, "you will do this way, or you will be gone." I can come back to them and say, "Well, I know from the contacts I have that we have to change." They

can just as easily say to me, "Why are your contacts any different than ours? We know those people are satisfied with what we are doing or the university has survived over these hundreds of years, nobody is going to come along and disrupt it now, so we can do whatever we want." Those kinds of opinions exist out there.

And part of the success of this, I guess that always frightens me, is that leaders in universities have to gain support more by virtue of their own ability to inspire confidence and trust in their colleagues and there is where a person like Dr. Horowitz [former President of the University of Alberta], is such a skilled leader, that he can come along to a group of deans and say, "I think we ought to do this, and will you get on-side with me?" And we'll be happy to do it. My fear as a Dean is that when I go to this Faculty, they may say, "Well, we don't particularly believe in Patterson and have a lot of confidence in him, therefore, we'll dismiss his opinion or viewpoint."

So there is a certain risk that I'll be taking in trying to assume a more active role with regard to this, because they may not question the document as much as question me. They may be saying to me "We don't respect your leadership" and so that's why if you really examine it, one side of these people could say to me "you were foolish to undertake it," because the foolishness might be that they would demonstrate that I can't bring it off. And it may just fail. So some people would prefer to try to do nothing rather than to try to do something and fail in trying to do it.

In coping with this kind of dilemma, the Dean set up a structure, which was separate from the formal administrative and academic structure of the Faculty to carry out the Strategic Planning Project. There were at least two reasons for the Dean to do this.

First, as pointed out in *The Current Status and Trends Study*, in the organizational structure of the Faculty, "no effective mechanism exists for systematic and ongoing review, evaluation, reaffirmation, revision, and/or redirection of Faculty programs, or for initiating and maintaining Faculty renewal" (McIntosh, 1987, p. 82).

The Dean had experienced an earlier planning process in this Faculty where decisions were made by the committee and then was sold to the Faculty. In this strategic planning process, he wanted to change the structure and to heavily involve faculty members at every stage of the process. As one Project Coordinator remarked, "We didn't want the present structure to have a heavy role to play . . . we didn't want to emphasize our present structure at all."

One informant who was a former Dean of the Faculty indicated that the earlier planning in this Faculty

was prepared through the Dean's Office, and through departments. And so, you had ideas and information collected from the departments, through department meetings, staff meetings, and department chairmen to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office then put all these together. So in the earlier planning, it all went through the formal structures and the administrators' existing leadership with planning, was central in all of the planning.

Then, he compared this with the current Strategic Planning Project,

What you have here, is a different structure. It is a new structure set up just for this. The administrators don't have central positions in it. And so hopefully, there will be a greater sense of ownership that the faculty members see as being their plan not the department chairman's, and not their Dean's.

Therefore, separating the Project from the formal Faculty structure could encourage greater faculty involvement and increase faculty members' sense of ownership of the Project.

The second reason was that the Faculty had become too department-bound. As McIntosh (1987) described, "the Faculty of Education could be likened to a federal state, a confederation of principalities, with limited means to influence the activity of individuals and departments. . . "(p. 77). One interviewee considered the Faculty of Education as an organization of a weak King surrounded by six strong warlords" to indicate the relationship between the Dean and the six department chairs. The Dean realized that the loyalty and commitment of the faculty members tended to be at the department level. Therefore, he attempted to establish a special structure, separated from the formal structure of the Dean's Office and departments, to steer the strategic planning, involve all the faculty members, and focus on fundamental faculty-wide issues so as to develop a sense of belonging and loyalty to the Faculty and create a common vision of the Faculty.

However, as Apps (1988) points out,

On most college and university campuses, the department is all-powerful Coupled with departmental structure, a system of faculty governance that allows faculty members to make nearly all the decisions about the operation of their departments makes change difficult at many institutions. In some respects this horizontal management system has worked well. Extremely strong departments exist across the country. The system breaks down when cross-departmental or campus issues are concerned, however. (p. 210)

By knowing the organizational inertia of the institution, the top administrators should involve the line managers for the whole process of the strategic planning. "Inadequate participation of these managers often results in resistance or withdrawal of support" (Chan, 1986, p. 9). As indicated by Cyert (1988), the President of Carnegie Mellon University, "It is first necessary to convince deans and department heads that strategic planning is necessary and will work as a way of improving quality in departments and colleges" in order to win support for the planning from them (p. 94). The strategic planning approach can only work well where members trust and cooperate with one another and have power to put their plans into action. Otherwise, the whole process will become an exercise in frustration that may ultimately alienate and embitter participants (Harrison, 1987, p. 114).

By and large, doing strategic planning in an collegial organization run by professional experts is not an easy job. As Baldrige et al. (1977) point out

The basic role of the collegial leader is not so much to command as to listen, not so much to lead as to gather expert judgments, not so much to manage as to facilitate, not so much to order but to persuade and negotiate. . . . Instead of technical problem-solving skills, the collegial leader needs professional expertise to ensure that he is held in high esteem by his colleagues. Talent in interpersonal dynamics is also needed to achieve consensus in organizational decision making. The collegial leader's role is more modest and more realistic. He does not stand alone, since other professionals share the burden of decision making with him. Negotiation and compromise are the bywords of collegial leader: authoritarian strategies are clearly inappropriate. (p. 25)

Cyert (1988) believes the top administrators must take the role of educator in the planning process. Part of their responsibility is to educate the line administrators about the concepts of guiding the institution's strategy (p. 97). Simerly (1987) observes that in order to fit strategic planning, the leaders will have to become developers of people and of problem-solving teams. They will need to concentrate on coaching and counselling in order to help staff members define for themselves a concept of continual professional development and self-renewal. Effective leaders move beyond the administrative aspects of their roles and become statespersons for the organizations they represent. In this statesperson role, they create a consensus for visions that require dynamic organizational cultures (p. 203).

The above discussion included the Dean's aspirations for, commitment to, and leadership style in the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. Dilemmas facing the Dean included how to link the mission statement with the Faculty, whether to link the Strategic Planning Project with budgeting, and how to balance centralized and participative decision-making approaches.

Involvement: Participation versus Frustration

This section deals with the nature of faculty involvement in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project and the reasons for the Faculty's declining interest and increasing frustration with the process of the Project.

Literature on strategic planning emphasizes strong executive leadership, external factors, marketing approaches, and institutional positioning. These new thrusts, rooted in the corporate management philosophy, have created direct conflicts with the collegial and normative academic culture. The emphasis on executive leadership and on a top-down approach in strategic planning appears to overshadow the preference for timely and adequate consultation, resulting in a great shift of power away from faculty to administration and threatening to turn the academic culture from a collegial, normative value to utilitarianism (Austin & Gamson, 1983).

However, Yukl (1981) identifies some disadvantages and limitations of broad participation:

- (1) Broad participation is time consuming and not usable when an immediate decision is needed;
- (2) Decisions based on extremely broad participation may not give adequate weight to the primary applicable expertise;
- (3) Group decision making diffuses organizational responsibility, making it difficult to assign responsibility for success or blame for failure;

- (4) Providing for participation in some areas may lead to expectations for participation in a broader range of decision than leaders may desire;
- (5) Extensive use of participation may result in a leader being viewed as weak; and
- (6) Participative decisions require special leadership skills and may lead to poor results if the leader lacks those skills (pp. 209-10).

Some other analysts of the strategic planning process have expressed concern about whether strategic planning assumes much in the way of faculty participation and influence and about the nature of likely future developments. Cope (1981) considers that widespread and active involvement of faculty and other campus constituencies can help delicately adjust the underlying ideas of strategic planning (pp. 55-6). Baldrige and Okimi (1982) believe, however, that faculty involvement is unlikely to have much impact on strategic planning (pp. 15-18). Therefore, Chan (1988) indicates that the literature on effective and desirable ways to involve faculty in strategic planning in higher education institutions is still at the developmental stage (p. 19).

In the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, according to Ingram (1989), an integral part of the procedures was the broad involvement of Faculty members and representatives from stakeholder groups. During every phase of the Project, these people were given opportunities for involvement through interviews, oral and written responses to reports, and attendance at feedback forums (p. 3). In Phase 1, fourteen faculty members, mostly, administrators, were interviewed for the Faculty Current Status and Trends Study. In Phase 2, one hundred and fifty faculty members (ninety-one percent of the total Faculty) were interviewed by eighteen faculty members who worked as interviewers for gathering feedback on the Current Status and Trends Study. Also in this Phase, four Issue Identification Feedback Forums were held and seventy-one people altogether, attended, including people from stakeholder groups. In Phase 3, eighteen faculty members were appointed to work for the Task Forces and Study Teams. During this Phase, few faculty members attended the forums on discussing the Mission Statement of the Faculty held by

the Task Force on Mission and Goals. Sixty-three faculty members participated in the Survey on Work and Rewards Study held by the Study Teams on Structure and Procedure and on Graduate Studies and Research. In Phase 4, approximately sixty faculty members attended the two Faculty of Education Councils each time to discuss the Report on Mission and Goals Statements and the Alternative Models on Teacher Education respectively.

One informant who was heavily involved in the Project noted,

I think in the early phase of the Project, the strategies were very good. We did consult with a wide range of people and interview key spokespeople from within the Faculty and outside the Faculty and we wrote a document which had its purpose to stimulate discussions within the Faculty. And then everybody in the Faculty was interviewed in the next stage.

Another informant who worked as a Study Team leader believed there was

a very high degree of involvement of faculty members at different stages, like when we interviewed faculty members, everybody in the Faculty was interviewed and people that I talked to seemed to be interested in the process and had something to say about the issues and I knew that at other time the level of involvement was varied, not as many people were involved in certain aspects of the process, but that was by their own choice, it was not for a lack of opportunity, it was because people chose not to participate.

One informant traced the involvement of the faculty members in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning process. In the early phase, "people were interested in it, enthusiastic about it, and willing to participate in it. . . . See, early in the interview, each of them was involved. Everybody had a chance." He went on commenting on this:

So when you look at the two-year circle, the first year I think is very good in terms of faculty involvement and interest. The second year is not so good. And now, we have the Report, but we don't know what to do with it. Nobody has told us what's really to happen.

The interest and enthusiasm to the Strategic Planning Project was declining, "because there wasn't an opportunity for continuing widespread participation. That's one reason. The second one, because it was not very progressive," he concluded.

Some other respondents considered that the Project became a low profile activity from a high profile one, so that caused disappointment and cynicism about the Project. Since the Project became less visible, faculty members started to lose interest in it. The

final Report tended not to emphasize very specific and concrete themes which faculty members could quickly either identify with or oppose. As one respondent perceived, "since those things are general and broad, they begin to dissipate quite easily, even though there's a nucleus of people who are the executive people involved in it and it's not the concern of all the 'little' people in the Faculty who may see that as too general or too ethereal." Another informant addressed the same point,

It was too brief, too fragmented to expect that considered positions would be developed out of that process. To do that takes an incredibly long period of time, extremely intensive effort, and keeping people continuously focussed on something, always turning their attention from--the tendency is to wander away from the central topic, to explore an interesting sideline.

Therefore, as Floyd (1985) points out, a faculty member must understand both the process used to reach a decision and the subject matter about which the decision is being made. The individual must also sense that the decision really is being influenced by the group of which he or she is a part and that the decision is not totally trivial (p. 64). Cynicism is becoming an increasing problem in faculty participation in higher education institutions because the substance and process of decision making are not sufficiently clear to the direct participants and are not at all evident to most of the faculty on campus (Chaffee, 1983, p. 51).

One informant pointed out another reason of the faculty members' loss of interest in the Project. "Because the faculty is essentially six departments and people feel at home in their departments, not so much at the Faculty. Because it wasn't happening at department level, they didn't know that." Another added, "unless there is a real problem, a real dilemma that brings people together, that transcends departments . . . those issues force a faculty to look at things beyond a particular department." Similarly, Dykes (1968) indicates that faculty members typically view effective and meaningful participation at the departmental level to be a major source of professional satisfaction, and they view departmental staff meetings as the most useful participatory device a higher education institution provides. Faculty most nearly achieve their conception of a group of

independent professionals running their own affairs when they actively participate in a relatively autonomous departmental unit (p. 30).

Another reason that one respondent indicated that this Project "was a kind of activity going off the side, it didn't necessarily make differences in their lives." Again, another commented, "If I can generalize from my own feeling, I think most people simply didn't feel that it was a central part of their life within the last three years." Another expressed his feeling:

the Strategic Planning Project is not a paramount aspect of my every day operation. It's not significant to me that I don't have a clear image. . . . This is an amazingly low profile activity. The profile in my estimation would need to be significantly higher in order for it to affect the way that I work . . . this is an activity that has some distance to me even though I have been involved in it.

One informant considered that "There is a thundering silence about the strategic planning process. . . . the process seems to be carried on in isolation from the conduct of our daily living, our daily working, our daily professional lives." To be effective, the planning process "has to intertwine with the day-to-day activities" and "to be conducted as a continuous and ongoing process of something that is in the consciousness of everyone," he contended.

Chan (1988) considers that the motivations to broaden and enhance faculty participation are (1) greater personal recognition, responsibility, and authority; and (2) the planner's emphasis on improving work conditions and faculty vitality (p. 21). Faculty priorities for resource commitment are closely linked to factors contributing to faculty vitality. Allocation decisions reflecting such priorities are often the most effective and direct way to cultivate institution-wide faculty support for strategic planning (p. 27). Kanter (1983) believes employees are interested in and willing to participate in decisions that affect their own work units and their own jobs and are generally uninterested in participating in broader matters of policy. The employees most interested in participation are those who are highly interested in the task at hand and also interested in personal

growth. Organizations have generally found that employees soon lose enthusiasm for the orientation toward participation in the absence of financial incentives or other formal rewards (pp. 242-43).

Upon reflection on the faculty involvement in the Project, one informant felt, "I, as an individual, have not been involved sufficiently in the process. I think that others, except ones who were on the Task Forces themselves, those people had very heavy involvements, but other people in the Faculty, were just peripherally involved." Then, he commented,

if the process was going to be successful to my mind, everybody needed to be quite heavily involved. Some of the issues, some of the problems should have been problems that were discussed in the department council meetings. The strategic planning process itself except the information very early in the process was never an agenda item in our department council. These past years very few Faculty Council meetings were held, at least a few of the issues that were here could have been addressed in Faculty Council.

However, the Faculty of Education Council (FEC) was not seen as a "productive forum," according to the findings of the Current Status and Trends Study. The reasons were identified as:

Poor attendance was often cited, as well as lack of follow-up or feedback on decisions. The FEC's basic dilemma was aptly described in these terms: while the Council does not want to simply "rubber-stamp" decisions that have already been made, at the same time it does not want to engage in "unproductive and time-wasting debate." This dilemma is exacerbated by poor attendance, which means that decisions cannot be made. Then, because the FEC is seen as "not doing anything," members feel less inclined to attend meetings, and the problem comes full circle. On the other hand, when meetings are well attended, issues tend to become bogged down in debate. The FEC is thus seen as unwieldy and slow because of its size. (McIntosh, 1987, pp. 82-3).

Obviously, there was a great dilemma concerning how to involve the faculty in the process of Faculty level decision making. Since the Faculty of Education follows the collegial governance and administrative model, the faculty members should have been involved in a wide range in the Faculty's administration. There should not be an exception in the Strategic Planning Project. As one interviewee speculated,

the decision was, "Let's try to involve the whole Faculty in this process," rather than "Let the managers represent what they think the Faculty thinks."

So the process, in terms of a strategic planning process, was one that broadened that base of information out to the Faculty as a whole, so that all faculty members had a role to play at various stages along the line. But whether that was wise or not was another question, because it was hard to keep a hundred and fifty, two hundred people involved . . . to a certain degree, there was a need to create an appearance that everybody was involved. . . .

One faculty member expressed his feeling on faculty involvement,

. . . it was involvement mainly as subjects in the research sense of it; it was not involvement as colleagues. I think a gloss, a facade of collegiality was invoked throughout, but I believe that that was a device that the people running the Project used so they could claim large-scale input and involvement, but when information was obtained, when the input was obtained and then it disappeared, I believe that that's manipulation. So I think the strategies that they used to get people involved were superficial, childish, really, so I think the process as a process had all the pieces in it. If you drew a diagram of it and printed out a chart on the computer, it would look very logical, but that there were some discrepancies in what happened to the data they obtained, so as a quasi research project, it was flawed.

He further commented,

. . . it strikes me, evidence from the interview study that there was concern in the minds of a good many people about power and the sharing of power and territorial allocation, the real stuff, the organizational design. Much of the stuff on that disappeared between the interview studies report and the next one or two stages, and I think they're all gone now. I believe that at that point the monitors of the process made a decision. . . . They dropped information that they had no reason to drop, that the people they selected for issue analysis were mainly of an administrator train of mind, and that there was a bias towards central administration of the Faculty in the issue selection, and once that happened, my belief was that the process from then on was inevitably going to be flawed in that respect, that the issue of organizational design hadn't adequately been dealt with. . . . Once the process was selected, it ground, as a machine would, to its conclusions. The key decisions were made perhaps in consultation with the Dean, but by the Project Directors. So, while the process was open, the key decisions were being made behind closed doors. I think some of them were clumsy decisions, trivial, obvious kinds of decisions. So they communicated about the things that were public and kept quiet about the important things.

With regard to selecting faculty members to participate in the various committees, one interviewee observed,

. . . the selection of people to do the review of the literature on teacher education, to write the first report, to head up the task forces reflect the personal history of the Project Director . . . and that traces of that same personalistic approach, as I see it, were to be found throughout the Project, that expertise wasn't what was sought . . . and that there was a little bit too much of the personalistic touch in the selection. . . .

Another informant added that "this was a product of personality and of people who know one another" and of "some pretty good friendships."

Swain (1988) underlines that one of the key contributors to successful strategic planning is to make the planning process open and accessible to those who have a legitimate need to participate and to take steps to ensure that the best, most self-confident, most imaginative faculty, staff, students, and administrators are appointed to the planning committees. In strategic planning, there is no substitute for broad perspectives and openness to responsible change (pp. 53-4). Continued willingness to participate also depends upon employees' perceptions that the advice given influences actions taken. In the absence of that perception, the actions of organizational leaders will be regarded as manipulative and viewed in an entirely negative light. Communicating exactly what will or what will not come out of the process is a very important step toward minimizing possible disappointment (Kanter, 1983, pp. 255-73). Shirley (1988) identifies one of the common pitfalls in strategic planning is failure to gain adequate institution-wide participation. Even when a democratic, grass-roots process is used to select a planning group, there is a tendency for the group to become isolated from colleagues and peers. Planning groups should energetically encourage the involvement of their colleagues. Open hearings, newsletters, active solicitation of ideas--these and other strategies should be employed to create a sense of identification with and ownership of the planning process throughout the campus community (p. 13).

However, Floyd (1985) points out that although active faculty participation is intrinsically valuable for effective decision making, a common dilemma facing institutions of higher learning is that "Faculty frequently express an obligation and the competence to participate but put low priority on actual participation" (p. 63). As one informant mentioned,

The faculty members feel indifferent about the strategic planning project, I suppose. If they are a little cynical about the planning to begin with, they say "No, no, I am not going to be the part of the plan. I'll wait and see the

final product of the planning." If you figure out the plan is going to be so general, then you say "Why should I be bothered getting involved? I don't have much impact on it. I'll wait and see what will come out, and then react to that." We've been through enough plans, we've been through the University's plan "Next Decade and Beyond", you know it's very, very general. Everybody knows it's a public relations document. Nobody within the University takes it seriously. It's for those people across the river [people from government]. It's scared the politicians a little bit. Ok, so we went through that one. And now we get this one. How many plans do we need? I am tired of plans.

Another informant added,

I really haven't found recently too many people who have been too interested in the process or the result. . . . The ones I have talked to were those who haven't read the document. Those that have looked at it are pessimistic and saying, "Well, it's written, put it aside and I am going on doing what I want to do."

Respondents believed that the Strategic Planning Project was probably a worthwhile exercise. "But I really don't have the time to get involved in it. I will get involved when it is going to start to pinch upon my life."

Since the Project has been in operation for more than four years, there has not been any action taken. One informant spoke about his frustration about the extended period of time.

Nobody is waiting with bated breath as if this [Project] will be the turning point in the history of the Faculty. We've been around too long, and there are very important resource allocation issues that surround us that will dictate what happens to us more than such a [Strategic Planning Project] report will. I have a hunch that the process dragged on a bit too long.

Baldridge and Okimi (1982) indicate that time orientation in strategic planning is short-range and medium-range. Strategic planning relies heavily on rapid assessment of the environment and on rapid decision-making that grapples with short-term and medium-range issues (p. 17). However, the timeline of the original proposal of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was established from January, 1986, when the Dean announcing the Project design, to April, 1988, when the final report was to be considered by the Dean. Actually, it took more than twice as long as was projected. One informant expressed his feeling about the mistiming of the Project:

Based on the fact that it started out as a two-year thing and it's obviously gone into more than twice of that, and maybe is headed towards three or four times of that. So strategically, if you're trying to equate it with military, or equate it with business and industry, time is a critical element. But time does not appear to have been critical in terms of this Project.

So, he concluded, "I'm not so sure that the leaders of the Project really understand the term 'strategic plan.' I still question that as a label." A respondent commented strongly, "I never really thought the word 'strategic' was appropriate . . . if it is strategic, then it's time bound, because it's movement in time and space, and that's important to how you move in space and in time together. Otherwise, the strategy cannot be expressed." Another interviewee was feeling disappointed, "By the time we've got the document--nothing's going to happen with it 'til the fall of '89, and the two Directors [Coordinators] have retired. I think if timing is everything in planning, then there has been some mistiming here." One informant pointed out:

Environment can change a great deal within four years. Plan in four years to do is probably out of date by the time it is finished. Just look at our graduate program, it takes four years to do, so the students start in that program when it starts the plan and finish for the time it finishes the plan. You are now dealing with the plan that involves most of the people who are of major significance when you start the plan they have finished, it doesn't make any sense. It's too slow.

One interviewee considered the time horizon of the Project was too long. If the purpose of strategic planning was to decrease cost, increase productivity, and improve quality, then this one was too time-consuming. He continued, "it took a lot of people's time, and some are very good people. . . . And unless there is some pretty strong payoff, I have to wonder whether that's time well spent."

As Chan (1988) points out, on many campuses, institution-wide faculty committees have been appointed to develop academic strategies and to guide the planning process. The effectiveness and contribution of this mode of faculty participation, which is often time consuming and fails to produce actions and priority, are unclear (p. 20).

Informants reflected upon the reasons for the mistiming of the Project. According to Ingram (1989), the basic principles adopted to guide the process of the Faculty of

Education Strategic Planning Project included (a) broad involvement of Faculty members and representatives of stakeholder groups in all phases of the study--from providing information and opinions to making decisions; (b) the use of an iterative process of planning and decision making; (c) the full and open sharing of information; and (d) the application of strategic planning methodologies (p. 3). One informant considered one of the reasons for the mistiming was the widespread consultation and involvement of larger number of faculty members. One Project Coordinator spoke of two reasons for the mistiming:

One was that we, in a way, underestimated the amount of work and the amount of time that some of these things would take. But I think another key reason was that in practice, in all of these cases, these people were working, this was an extra thing. . . . So we found that it was because of the lack of time of these people, release time to do more things . . . the lack of resources to release people so they couldn't put more time into it.

According to the researcher's own experience, one problem that exists with any university planning is that people are reluctant to go into a substitutive mode in terms of change or innovation. They tend to have to operate on an additive mode. That means anything new that they want to do requires additional resources and capabilities, and it is extremely difficult for the university and the faculties to substitute one thrust or endeavor for another. Therefore, it always takes longer time than expected.

On the other hand, the process of this Project was unduly complex, and each one of these stages had to go through the lengthy and repetitious procedures. They made sense in the way in which people reasoned, and it was all logical and developed in steps. But the result of that was very time consuming. Furthermore, the Faculty of Education, is a collegial organization run by the academic professionals. The faculty members have a tremendous amount of freedom in deciding whether they commit themselves to the Project or not, so it has to have the slow, rational kind of development. One faculty member who believed that any kind of planning in the Faculty might need longer time than expected, noted,

We have to involve everybody in the Faculty to make them feel involved and academics by the very nature don't work fast, we have no deadlines set for us in almost anything that we do. We are used to working to our own timeline. We are used to working over a long period of time. Our organization is a collegial organization so everybody feels they have to be involved. So it just has to take a long time, given the environmental kind of people that you are working, if you are in business where you can tell people what to do, tell them what the priorities are, that's different.

Simerly (1987) contends that to design and implement a comprehensive and effective strategic plan in an higher educational institution is a labour-intensive and time-consuming business. It is important to give the planning committee adequate time to collect data, organize it, seek advice from staff, and make recommendations (p. 25). However, the time frame for this medium-and long-term planning is frequently confusing to faculty who are relatively unfamiliar with such planning activity. Close administrative attention to working with faculty to increase a sense of time perspective has been noted to greatly reduce faculty frustration with strategic planning.

The above revealed that the nature of Faculty involvement in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was somewhat symbolic and superficial. The reasons for the Faculty's declining interest and increasing frustration with the Project were identified as the Project's (a) inconsistency, (b) low visibility, (c) extended time-line, (d) repetitious procedures, and (e) lack of incentives.

Culture: Institutional versus Strategic

In this section, discussion focuses on the organizational culture of the Faculty of Education existed during the period of the Strategic Planning Project.

Most of the writers on strategic planning either in business or in higher education contend that understanding the organizational culture and developing a climate for strategic planning are key factors for carrying out strategic planning.

Walter et al. (1984) indicate

An organization's culture is reflected in its formal and informal principles, policies, procedures, values and attitudes. Often, there are enormous

differences in organizational cultures. . . . Whatever these differences are, however, the more the organizational culture supports the formal processes of foresight, goal setting, strategic planning, operational management and evaluation, the stronger the organization will be. Understanding the culture of an organization and shaping it to support strategic activities are therefore essential planning and management tools (pp. 47-8).

Harman (1989) pointed out culture was used to represent publicly created and collectively accepted patterns of meanings embodied in such symbolic forms as language, belief and action or "webs of significance" which produce a distinctive way of life (p. 35). Awareness of the basic cultural differences can provide useful knowledge for those chief administrators who engage in mapping the future of the institution. If this understanding develops, then it is more likely that policy is not only decided by better informed people, but also that it is likely to be better received by those whose professional lives are affected by it. As Becher (1980) contends,

polices, to be fully effective, have to be commensurated with the values of those they govern. In higher education, the central functions of teaching and research are not necessarily well served by decisions made by politicians and administrators with no understanding of the different forms of academic life. A policy is a good deal more likely to be workable if it is in tune with the working context of the practitioners who are expected to translate it into action (p. 4).

Many writers discussed the common features of culture of higher educational institutions in North America. University is "one of the most complex structures in modern society . . . because its formal structure does not describe either actual power or responsibilities" (Perkins, 1973, p. 3) and its "academic activities in general are embedded in a climate of ambiguity and uncertainty" (Pedersen et al., 1981, p. 4). In the words of one informant who was a senior official of a stakeholder group of the Faculty of Education:

The universities are very complex social organizations, and they're very difficult to change. When Woodrow Wilson was elected President of the United States in 1918, I think it was, somebody asked him how would he cope with changing from being President of the university and being in this academic atmosphere to being President of the United States and having this tremendous bureaucracy to cope with all the problems of a national government. He said he thought he'd find it quite a rest going from what he saw as a very complicated university to what he saw as this simple national government. So a university is a very complex organism.

Cohen and March (1974, p. 34)) define university as an "organized anarchy" and Baldrige et al. (1977) perceive that:

The organized anarchy differs radically from the well-organized bureaucracy or the consensus-bound collegium. It is an organization in which generous resources allow people to go in different directions without coordination by a central authority. Leaders are relatively weak and decisions are made by individual action. Since the organization's goals are ambiguous, decisions are often by-products of unintended and unplanned activity. In such fluid circumstances, presidents and other institutional leaders serve primarily as catalysts or facilitators of an ongoing process. They do not so much lead the institution as channel its activities in subtle ways. They do not command, but negotiate. They do not plan comprehensively, but try to apply pre-existing solutions to problems (p. 15).

For Cameron (1980) the major characteristics of organized anarchy are that its parts are loosely tied together and its subunits are largely autonomous. Few common structures or linkages flow throughout organized anarchies to bind the subunits together. Either the most common linking pins--the technology or method of doing work, common purposes and goals, and the formalized hierarchy of authority--are not present in organized anarchies, or their linking power is weak (p. 70).

Clark (1983) points out that institutions of higher education are seen as preeminent examples of loosely coupled systems in which ambiguity results from soft technologies, fragmented work, and participants who wander in and out, as well as from vague goals. This perspective has been valuable in pointing out the great gap that exists between traditional models of decision-making and the realities of academic organizations (p. 23).

Mangham (1982) considers that the university's decision making system is essentially unique, wherein all faculty members may participate despite their ostensible lack of understanding of, and commitment to, an institutional sense of purpose. He also identifies university as a theatre and as "an association of loosely organized souls (who) seek to protect themselves, acquire and expend resources through a system based in committees and are lacking any widely shared institutional goal" (p. 60).

In comparison with the institutional culture described above, the Faculty of Education is an embedded organization of its parent organization--the University of

Alberta. It is one of the biggest and most diversified faculties, and is paralleled with the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. As one informant described:

... in this particular case we have a dual structure, and it relates to the two environments: You have the Faculty of Graduate Studies, which is fairly monolithically set on one set of values, that is, research, and concomitant publication; and you have the Faculty of Education, which ought to be focused on a competing set of values, which is in the teaching and service areas. And the fact is that each one of these sets of values has a structure for it and that many of the faculty are involved in both of these structures personally. I mean, there are professors here who are professors in the Faculty of Education, but they're also professors in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, so there's an outlet for each of the sets of values, or, if you like, looking at it from the opposite direction, there's an input of each of these sets of values from the same individuals. The individuals are going to either have some sensation of role conflict, or, looking at it from a different angle, they're going to have a place where they can park their prejudices and feel comfortable. They can identify with the Faculty of Education if they have one subset, or they can identify with the Faculty of Graduate Studies if they have a different set. They can choose to which of the two faculties they're going to ascribe their loyalties, and that makes for a difficult organizational structure. The Dean of one faculty, of Education, is going to have less impact than he would have if there were not Faculty of Graduate Studies for some of his members to relate to. ... But having said all that, I guess the primary lesson that you end up with is that it is a very complex structure and, therefore, very difficult to change.

In the eyes of one respondent,

... the size and the diversity of this Faculty, make the planning process difficult if you intend to set priorities, because we are so diverse ... because of the diversity, there are a lot of perceptions about what the major problems are. ... Everybody had their own ideas about what was important, and I'm not so sure that we've gone very far down the road at building consensus in this process. Most of us still have our own agendas there. Yes, we're part of this faculty, but the diversity of the Faculty allows us to go our own paths and not necessarily to feel like there is some higher priority that the Faculty has agreed upon.

In terms of the goals of the Faculty, one senior faculty member pointed out:

We've had goals of teacher education since the first time that Mark Hopkins sat on one end of the log, and his students sat on the other end of the log, and they had a conversation. So you can't set aside things and say, "These are going to be our goals from now on." Most of the goals that we really have are implicit rather than explicit. We can't even verbalize them, and when we do verbalize them, we trivialize them very often, so that's part of the reason that I think that we have tended to tackle what are extremely complex matters in oversimplified ways. You can't do that; you cannot solve complex issues in simple ways. It doesn't work. An organization, the size and diversity of the Faculty of Education simply cannot be steered.

Sibley (1986) contends if strategic planning in universities is to be effective, some genuine degree of consensus on goals and mission is essential. However, he believes consensus only emerges to the degree that faculty members feel themselves to be members of some community, only where they have shared understandings of common purposes, and shared values and expectations. If decision makers have established a good rapport with their faculty, so that there is a good cognitive and emotive resonance between the two groups, some sense of community will have been achieved. In its absence, planning will not have roots outside the central administration and will be increasingly ineffective in universities of today (p. 97).

However, as one informant indicated

The biggest problem that we have, I think, with the planning that occurred and that embeddedness is that the universities tend to operate on a consensus model. They strive for consensus among all participants. . . . The one problem that there is in the consensus model is that you generally find consensus at the mean, not at the outer edges, and the thing that I fear is that the planning model itself and the operation of the faculty still is based on what I call "academocracy." "Academocracy" is not a way to greatness; I think it regresses to mediocrity. There's that fundamental fear. You can get consensus to do nothing, generally; that's easy to do. Or consensus in areas where there is least impact on individuals . . . any major changes by consensus, and I think that is going to compromise the capacity to make any significant changes.

Another respondent added,

When you look at the way the Faculty is organized . . . that these are all individual scholars and professors, and it's very hard to get them to assent to a group process. In fact, professors all over the university quite pride themselves on having their own individual ideas and arguing for them very strongly, and it's very hard to get a group of a hundred and sixty academics to agree on anything. It's hard to get a group of five to agree on anything. They love to argue and debate. I think that's just the nature of the professor. I think that's the way professors are built. That's their training, also.

The Dean expressed his concern,

Because the university model is built so much on democratic process--that's grassroots ideas--that if you don't have a consensus or majority opinion among the participants then no leader is going to be able to require them to do something.

Therefore, one informant concluded

a fundamental dilemma of strategic planning in a university is that the way university is defined as a community of scholars, people are expected to initiate their own program of work and one has to hope that when a hundred and fifty people initiated their own program of work that would add up to a set of activities. We have to meet a full range of expectations for the Faculty that were held by the various stakeholders, but it's almost by accident, because everything is built up from the bottom rather than plan it from the top. . . . And in some organizations the common purposes were very clear . . . but in a university, it's very difficult to, except at the very high level of generalization, it's very hard to state that common purposes and it's more accurate to say that individuals at the university have purposes. . . . So, it's very difficult to do strategic planning in the university for that reason.

Institutional culture also includes models, policies, and procedures of governance of the institution. The university governance model in North America fits the collegial model. In the University of Alberta, two systems of authority are superimposed in its governance: a collegial committee system upon a bureaucratic system. In the structure of the Faculty, as described by McIntosh (1987), departments enjoy and exercise a larger degree of autonomy and a larger degree of influence in Faculty governance than the organizational chart would suggest, because (1) academic staff members are appointed to departments rather than to the Faculty; (2) instructional assignments are made by department chairs; (3) performance review and appraisal are initiated at the departmental level; (4) advice to students on their individual programs is largely given at the departmental level; and (5) initiatives for course and program change originate with the departments. According to one respondent, most of the department chairs of the Faculty showed a lack of interest in the Faculty Strategic Planning Study and a lack of willingness to analyze or comment on Faculty-wide concerns. In his eyes, the Faculty was organized as

a feudal realm in which the Dean is like the King, and a not very strong King who is surrounded by feudal lords, each of which is very strong, and those are the department chairs . . . some department chairs really, saw their primary role as representing interests of their department rather than supporting the Dean in his faculty-wide leadership.

In terms of the autonomy of the faculty members, McIntosh (1987) indicates,

as individuals, they are expected to develop independent programs of research, development, and professional service. A norm of professional and academic independence is encouraged, even required. Individuals are thus expected to define professional goals and to establish programs of

research and service to achieve them in a manner influenced by professional and academic standards rather than by organizational priorities. The latter may be largely meaningless or irrelevant to individual staff in an academic setting (p. 75).

The Faculty of Education is described as "a collectivity of largely autonomous professionals and academics brought together for selected purposes into departments" and it "could be likened to a federal state, a confederation of principalities, with limited means to influence the activity of individuals and departments." (McIntosh, 1987, pp. 75-77)

Therefore, the institutional culture in universities, including the consensus model, the collegial model, "organized anarchy", loose coupling, and the lack of common goals and purposes conflicts with strategic culture.

According to Steeples (1988), strategic planning faces some other formidable obstacles in university setting. One of these is sheer inertia--the fact that it is generally more comfortable to continue to act in habitual ways even when a crisis looms. Another is that strategic planning obliges one to deal with an ambiguous future, and many academicians are averse to ambiguity and risk and have chosen professional careers for the security they offer. And also faculty do not like to plan and chief administrators are "not masochistic" (p. 103). Lindquist (1978) indicated,

Colleges and universities may be great places to get all kinds of new ideas initiated, but terrible places to get them implemented. Professors, as other professionals, are hard to channel and control. In consequence, colleges and universities end up no different from other organizations; once a program does get implemented, it turns to granite. Whether the institution be a "model" or a "maverick", it develops its version of the status quo and then sticks to it, not for lack of new ideas but for lack of consensus and control needed to implement changes or because an "institutional saga" has defined the organization's identity (p. 18).

Just as one informant indicates,

... those people who worked on the various task forces probably have a feeling of ownership and certainly a feeling of support ... because the people who are working on the task forces are, by and large, the people who are willing to look at change. The guys that are hiding back in the corners are probably the ones that are going to be hard to move, so the question then arises: How do you get them going? What do you do along the line to overcome the inertia of those who don't want to move? They're comfortable where they are because it's a known world, and they're getting

by from day to day, and it's not too troublesome, but change always involves risk.

In relation to the institutional inertia in the Faculty, another informant added,

... in the university we have moved more and more to independence of action. And so most staff members look at their life only from the stand point of "Do I have a comfortable office, do I have a teaching load that I am satisfied with, am I been fairly rewarded for my efforts?" They want to do their own things. The next level is they'll show some commitment to the department because that's the next level of government beyond themselves. Then, to a faculty level, so, when you started talking about faculty planning here, most of them don't see that is very close to their day-to-day operation. ... They didn't care what somebody else was doing, elsewhere in the Faculty, they just wanted to be sure that their part was not different unless they wanted to be different. Well, that's the way they'll approach this too. "Is it going to make me have to change what I am already content and satisfied doing?" And the older the people get, very often the more comfortable they become, the less likely they are to want to be different.

A respondent expressed his way of making change in the Faculty, which reflects part of the Faculty members' way of thinking in planning:

I think any human system made up of hundred and fifty odd people should gradually evolve and not be subject to major changes regardless of how those changes are brought about. So, there should be gradual evolution and adaptation in which if errors are made, they are not so serious that they can not be corrected ... It's far less disruptive and gives time for people to adapt to changes and see whether they like it or not. A planning process that may go through a lot of discussions and then must end up with major changes, can only cause backlash and reaction against it because the change may be far too abrupt for the human system. ... I'd prefer an evolutionary process rather than an initiation of things like this ... what I would prefer to see is an open annual report by the Dean's Office delivered once a year on the status of the Faculty of Education. And at that time you would also present how the budget was expended to show, in retrospect, what was done during the last year. I think that kind of procedure done every year would be a more evolutionary approach which could bring change to the equilibrium approach.

According to *The Current Status and Trends Study Report*,

It seems that the Faculty lacks a sense of shared purpose: there is a pervasive sense that the Faculty is "stumbling along". The Faculty is generally perceived to be strong and productive in terms of individuals, but communication among them seems to have decreased, and there seems to be a growing tendency toward "closed systems" or isolation of various research groups in the Faculty. Members of the Faculty tend to "look inward" rather than seeking out external relationships as they once did ... there is a widespread recognition of changing expectations as well as indications that individual change in response to new expectations is difficult. Interviewees perceive that there is less "zest" and vitality in the Faculty that there used to be ... The Faculty "culture" is seen as tending

towards non-confrontation of issues, which detracts from the effectiveness of collegial problem-solving and contributes to a sense of powerlessness and "wheel-spinning" (McIntosh, 1987, pp. 86-7).

Therefore, the organizational health of the Faculty of Education can be approached from the point of view that:

If one's view is that the Faculty is essentially and substantially anarchistic, decentralized, dependent on individuals and units, then it can be considered in good health. If one views the Faculty from a larger perspective, however, placing greater value on mission, direction, co-ordination, and co-operation, then the Faculty can be seen as not nearly so healthy (McIntosh, 1987, p. 87)

However, a commonly held mission, direction, and coordination are highly valued by the strategic culture.

Cope (1985) believes the collegial model presumably works where there is a shared sense of values, commitment to the institution, a spirit of cooperation, and a view that there is not much of any hierarchy (p. 19). Shirley (1988) points out that the analysis of personal values as a component in decision making has not received enough attention in the literature or in the practice of strategic planning. Personal values, which include one's "conception of the desirable," are critical determinants of personal and group responses to the overall strategic plan. Among other things, values define what groups and individuals want to do as the institution moves through time. Like it or not, values will intrude in the decision-making process as planners frame strategies for the future (pp. 11-12). Lisenšky (1988) strongly believes that "the strategic planning process must be grounded in a specific institution's values (p. 21). Tabatoni and Jarniou (1976) indicate,

there is no "strategic management" unless the organization is willing and able to develop a critical appraisal of its own management conception and practice, through the search for and the implementation of innovative strategies. Planning systems, structures and social control practices must be such that they permit and even promote that critical attitude and that will for policy changes. This implies a political system of the organization willing and able to go in that direction, and what might be called the dominance of a "strategic culture" or "strategic language" within that organization.(p. 34)

As Gluck (1975) points out "it is essential that the planning process not be started before clear understanding and agreement are reached on the key values prevailing in the

organization" (p. 12). The reason for identifying organizational values, according to Simerly (1987), is that such values directly influence how people behave. These values determine the organizational culture, which is the most powerful force affecting any organization. A strategic planning process that is inconsistent with the organization's culture stands little chance of success (pp. 14-5). Therefore, it is necessary to create organizational readiness for strategic planning before carrying out it. Any new organizational process with such far-reaching implications as strategic planning will meet with some resistance. This resistance will often center on getting answers to questions such as:

- a) Is this a hidden plan to get me to double my productivity without any additional resources?
- b) Will I receive recognition if I put forth extra effort to implement strategic planning?
- c) How will strategic planning benefit the organization in ways that I can see and that are meaningful to me?
- d) Will strategic planning make my work life better and more enjoyable?
- e) Will strategic planning increase or decrease the autonomy I value in my daily problem solving?

Therefore, it is essential to prepare the organization for this activity and, especially, to let staff members bring their concerns to the surface. Addressing this emotional or feeling level of behavior is important if strategic planning is to succeed.

In the literature of strategic planning in higher education, competition with other institutions and entrepreneurship or "risk taking" is also highly valued and frequently listed as a central characteristic of strategic planning (Baldrige, 1982; Keller, 1983).

The environmental situation of the higher educational institutions here in Canada, especially in Alberta is not as competitive as those in the United States. The environments of the Faculty of Education are not as turbulent as that of others because of its national reputation. Even the financial problems are not too serious to survive. As a result,

strategic thinking in planning and decision making is not strongly emphasized. One informant who is a senior official of a stakeholder group of the Faculty agreed with this viewpoint:

I would agree that there isn't that same dimension of competition and the need to make adjustments; it isn't there, not in Canadian universities, not in Alberta, certainly. The Faculties of Education in this province don't really compete with each other by any stretch of the imagination. . . . The University of Alberta with its two Faculties of Education [the Faculty of Education and The Faculte St. Jean] and the University of Calgary effectively control the whole market. It's almost a monopoly. There's not a tremendous value in competitiveness.

Sibley (1986) contends one of the impediments to strategic planning is that Canadian universities are firmly and irrevocably engrafted in a system supported by public funding and are therefore subject to all the pressures that the system imposes on them. He goes on:

The kinds of competition in which *private* institutions must engage, as in the United States, has vanished from the Canadian scene. And our political realities are such that they are all going to be kept in business. They may *languish* but they will *survive*. . . . We are therefore . . . not in a Darwinian struggle for survival. We face no such threats as the possibility that up to 30 percent of our universities may disappear or be swallowed up in some merger by 1995. We don't have the stimulus for the "tremble factor" (p. 86).

Quite a number of respondents agree with this viewpoint. One argues, "The university only reacts when there is some kind of crisis, or some kind of external intervention. In the absence of crisis and external intervention, universities are very slow to change themselves." Another contends,

the history of bringing about changes in organizations like universities often shows that it doesn't happen internally; it happens through external pressure by either government or somebody just after a while decreeing and saying, "That's the way it will be," or the President's Office or somebody just making some major decisions that way. Or sometimes it's done by government just keeping the cut-off funds in certain ways until the people inside realize that something has to be done. So it's very difficult within a university atmosphere to bring about that kind of change, unless there's a great deal of emphasis and pressure from outside.

It is not surprising that strategic planning expert George Keller concluded that planning "does not take very well" in an already successful situation. Rather, a real or perceived

external threat, new opportunities, or an ambition for greatness seem to be requisites for gaining support for strategic planning in higher education (Roach, 1988, p. 62).

The above review on the culture within the Faculty of Education that existed during the period of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project revealed the presence of a traditional institutional culture rather than one clearly strategic in orientation. The institutional culture which included the following attributes: a collegial model, organized anarchies, loose coupling, professional autonomy, lack of common purpose, low value of competition, and insensitivity to external environments, conflicts with a strategic culture.

Summary

In this chapter four themes are identified and discussed in relation to the literature on strategic planning and the reflections upon the processes and issues involved in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. The four themes are Models: Strategic Planning versus Traditional Planning; Leadership: Aspiration versus Actuality; Involvement: Participation versus Frustration; and Culture: Institutional Versus Strategic. In order to make strategic planning successful, the top administrators must (1) understand the difference between rational planned change and strategic planning; (2) have a full commitment to strategic planning; (3) encourage faculty participation; and (4) develop an appropriate strategic planning culture. However, the major obstacles for carrying out strategic planning are also identified: (1) the influence of the ways of traditional planning; (2) the dilemma facing the leadership and their styles and skills; (3) the lack of strategies to motivate faculty involvement; and (4) institutional inertia and tradition.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, REFLECTIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This final chapter provides a summary of the purpose, the design and methodology, the findings of the study, and the researcher's personal reflections. The chapter concludes with implications for practice and for further research.

Summary of the Study

Statement of the Problem

The general purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the process whereby the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta initiated, designed, and implemented its Strategic Planning Project. The major question which directed this study was: On what basis did the leadership of the Faculty of Education decide to initiate a Strategic Planning Project and how was it carried out? The following subsidiary questions guided this study:

1. What were the major factors which influenced the Dean of the Faculty of Education to initiate the Strategic Planning Project?
2. What were the design and structure of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project?
3. How was the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project carried out?
 - a) What approaches and procedures were employed in the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
 - b) What outcomes resulted from the process of the Strategic Planning Project?

- c) Who were involved in the process of the Strategic Planning Project and what was the nature of their involvement?

Research Design and Methodology

The study was designed within the interpretive paradigm using a case study methodology which focused upon the development and implementation of a strategic planning project at a particular institution, the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta, over a specific time period from November, 1985 to November, 1989. The process of the Strategic Planning Project was investigated as it was occurring.

The data collection techniques included document reviews and 25 in-depth interviews. A thorough document search provided the researcher with background information on the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project. The document review, the related literature review, and the major research question and subsidiary questions shaped the semi-structured interview guide. As the data were gathered, insights and meaning took form which guided subsequent data collection. Purposive sampling and modified progressive nomination techniques were used to identify interviewees. All the interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed by a professional typist. Major perceptions and topics which emerged from the interviews were returned to informants for a member check.

All the data gathered from document reviews and interviews were processed and analyzed through coding, categorizing, identifying, and eventually linking of themes.

Findings of the Study

The findings are summarized as responses to the three subsidiary research question which guided this inquiry.

1. What were the major factors which influenced the Dean of the Faculty of Education to initiate the Strategic Planning Project?

The initiation of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was influenced by the following identified factors.

First of all, the impact of the University planning process. The Faculty of Education is an embedded organization of the University of Alberta; therefore, the University policies, and procedures had a direct influence upon the Faculty. The University PACCR Reviews had been completed in most of the departments of the Faculty of Education before the Faculty Strategic Planning Project was initiated. These reviews and evaluations, whatever their relevance and value to individual departments, were not touching matters of interest and consequence to the total Faculty. The Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was set up to review the the issues which transcended the departments so as to fill the gaps between department reviews (PACCR) and to obtain a comprehensive picture of the objectives and functions of the Faculty.

Meanwhile, The University of Alberta was also undertaking a strategic planning enterprise under the title *The Next Decade and Beyond*. Planning was becoming a part of the University's general climate and culture. The goals and priorities set up by the University planning had implications for the Faculty of Education. Whether considering size, programs, balance and mix of students, or service and research contributions, there was reason for the Faculty to explore the ideas and recommendations of the University strategic planning study. Therefore, the Faculty was seeking the opportunity to establish its own strategic planning project so as to determine its own priorities and direction and position itself appropriately.

Secondly, reaction to the external, social, demographic, technological, political, and economic pressures. Although the external environment of the Faculty of Education was not as turbulent as that of higher education institutions in the United States, it had been changing rapidly.

Socially, in North America, some major studies in education in mid-1980 proposed some dramatic reforms in teacher education in order to meet the needs of the twenty-first century. This became an impetus for the Faculty of Education to examine its own conditions to make some improvements.

Demographically, the undergraduate enrollments, while essentially stable in total number, were increasing in the senior years of the programs. On the other hand, the economic slowdown in Alberta caused an alleged oversupply of teachers in the Province. These factors forced the Faculty to respond.

Technologically, the continuing expansion in knowledge and the rapid change in technology challenged the Faculty to consider meeting these demands in its teacher education programs.

Politically, the government agencies, the stakeholder groups of the Faculty had identified problems in teacher education programs, and the role of the Faculty of Education in teacher education and continuously called for a review and change in teacher education in the Faculty. It was high time for the Faculty of Education to review itself under the title of strategic planning so that its image to the external groups would be enhanced.

Economically, the resources of the Faculty were in decline, but at the same time, pressures on the Faculty for expansion of services and increased productivity were growing. Furthermore, the tenured faculty had dropped by ten percent and the amount and flexibility of the teaching resources had been reduced dramatically. These financial pressures forced the Dean to set up priorities through the Strategic Planning Project so that resources could be used more wisely. On the other hand, through this Project, a rationale could be developed for requiring additional resources from government and University and allocating resources within the Faculty.

Thirdly, to build Faculty-level commitment. The Dean saw that in this Faculty, people had gained more and more independence of action and their commitment tended to be at the level of their departments. Departments in this Faculty were very strong and

autonomous units. Therefore, one of the Dean's purposes for establishing the Strategic Planning Project was to encourage faculty members to develop a similar sense of belonging and loyalty to the Faculty as they had for their departments. In order to have faculty members change their attitude and orientation and increase commitment to the Faculty, the Dean attempted to use the process of the Strategic Planning Project to achieve a consensus of mission, goals and priorities of the Faculty so as to create a commonly held vision for the Faculty.

Finally, the Faculty needed impetus for change and improvement. Although some informants speculated that the Dean had a hidden agenda up his sleeve and attempted to use the Project to reshape the Faculty, the Dean contended that he intended to use the process of the Project to create an impetus for institutional change and renewal. Because this Faculty had a favorable reputation in Canada, it was easier for the Faculty to become complacent and rest on its previous performance. The Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project would provide an opportunity for faculty to look at where they were; what they were doing; where they they should be; and how to get there. This impetus would make the Faculty more creative, imaginative, and change-oriented.

By and large, the researcher found out that the leadership of the Faculty of Education had picked very good, authentic, and rational reasons to start up a strategic planning project. The researcher perceived that the most important reason was to build Faculty-level commitment through the process of the Project.

2. What were the design and structure of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project?

The design of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was based on the Dean's prior experiences of working in this Faculty. Because of the above-mentioned catalytic forces upon the Faculty, the Dean, at the very beginning, intended to set up a self review study which was adapted from the University PACCR process, but under his

direction. Acting on this intention, therefore, the Dean asked three senior faculty members to draft a proposal for the Faculty Self Study. The scope of this study covered:

- (1) the mission of the Faculty,
- (2) the organization of the Faculty,
- (3) the services provided,
- (4) internal and external relationships, and
- (5) the policies and programs of concern to the Faculty as a whole which were not specific to any one department.

The objectives of the Study included:

- (1) description of the trends and current status of the Faculty;
- (2) identification of issues facing the Faculty;
- (3) consideration of alternative approaches to issue resolution;
- (4) development of recommendations for processes and procedures for moving toward issue resolution; and
- (5) presentation of a report to the Dean and the Faculty.

The timeline for the Study was established from January, 1986 when the Dean announced the Self Study to April, 1988 when the final study report was to be considered by the Faculty. After the Faculty Self Study Proposal was approved by the Dean, he appointed two Coordinators to be in charge of this study. In April of 1986, the Coordinators changed the title from Faculty Self Study to the Faculty of Education Planning Study. Financial planning was not included. However, the design was kept as the same as the Faculty Self Study. At the beginning of 1987, the Coordinators again changed the Faculty of Education Planning Study to the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project.

Although the Dean did not really know all the ingredients of strategic planning, in a general sense, he tried to use the term "strategic planning" to initiate an institutional renewal. The Coordinator who expanded the study into the Strategic Planning Project attempted not

only to use the term, but also to introduce the approach of strategic planning to the Faculty Planning Study.

From some informants' perspectives, the term "strategic planning" used in the Project was not thoroughly understood and accepted by the Faculty. They believed that this design came from a planned change model, specifically from organizational development (OD) theory. However, using the title "strategic planning", which was a pragmatic, popular, current, and democratic term, did not change the nature of the Faculty Self Study.

The structure of the Project was set up separately from the formal administrative and academic structures of the Faculty. Since it was the Dean's initiative to establish this Project, he stood at the top of the structure of the Project. Then, he appointed two faculty members as Coordinators in charge of the Project. Under the two Coordinators, in Phase One, two sub-studies were set up: one was the Current Trends and Status Study and the other was a Literature Review Study on Teacher Education; in Phase Two, the Coordinators organized a Panel including eight experts outside the Faculty and four experts within the Faculty to help identify issues facing the Faculty; in Phase Three, two Task Forces and two Study Teams were set up to develop alternative resolutions of major issues. In the final phase: Action Plan, due to the retirement of the two Coordinators, the Dean started to be fully in charge of the implementation of the Project.

From the perceptions of most of the informants, the Dean set up the structure for the Project, encouraged it to take place, and then stood back from the Project. Therefore, all the decisions were made by the Coordinators. However, the Coordinators had the Dean as front man so that faculty members could understand the Dean's support and commitment to the Project.

Since the structure of the Project was separated from the formal Faculty structure, the department chairs did not play an important role in the Project. The Faculty of Education Council (FEC) was seldom used as a forum to communicate with faculty

members in regard to the progress of the Project. The Newsletter set up for the project was considered to be an irregular information device.

3. How was the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project carried out?

- a) What approaches and procedures were employed in the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
- b) What outcomes resulted from the process of the Strategic Planning Project?
- c) Who were involved in the process of the Strategic Planning Project and what was the nature of their involvement?

The Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project was designed to cover four major phases, each with its own approach and set of procedures. In Phase One the objective was to identify and describe the trends and current status of the Faculty in respect to its mission, organization, services, interrelationships, policies, and programs. In order to achieve this objective, the Project set up two studies: one was the Current Status and Trends Study, which was designed to assist Faculty members and stakeholder groups to inform themselves about the Faculty and stimulate them to consider issues facing the Faculty; and the other, A Review of the Literature on Issues in Teacher Education, which was designed as an information source for those involved in identifying issues faced by the Faculty and for those considering alternative approaches to issue resolution.

To start with the Current Status and Trends Study, the Coordinators assigned it to a senior faculty member who had wide expertise and experience to do this kind of study. It was intended to be a descriptive study. Qualitative data were collected through (1) surveying the operations of selected faculties of education in Canada and in the United States, (2) reviewing the available University and Faculty reports, documents, and records, and (3) interviewing people external and internal to the Faculty of Education.

Twenty-eight interviews were held with key spokespeople within the Faculty, senior administrative officers within the University and representatives from the stakeholder

groups. Interviews with people outside the Faculty were carried out using a three-question interview guide while interviews with people within the Faculty were conducted using an eight-question interview guide. After data collection and analysis, a Report entitled *The Dynamics of Diversity* was written and distributed to the faculty members and stakeholder groups.

The Report was in a two-column page format. The wide column of text was used to describe the Faculty of Education. The narrower column presented brief excerpts and quotations from the current research literature on teacher education from Canada and from international reports on new directions proposed for teacher education specifically and for faculties of education in general, and from material provided by selected faculties of education about their current activities. The Report described the major characteristics and strengths of the Faculty and examined the conditions and environments which were influencing the change and renewal of the Faculty. Three themes emerged from the Report: 1) A Matter of Balance; 2) The Web of Relationships; and 3) A Question of Quality.

The other study, A Review of the Literature on Issues in Teacher Education was assigned to a retired expert in teacher education. His major assignment was to review the literature indicating trends, new ideas, pressures on teacher education, developments in teacher education in other jurisdictions. He and his associates did extensive library searches in Alberta, Canada, and in English speaking countries to collect related information and materials. The report of literature review had been completed and distributed in February of 1987.

The report focussed on the environment of faculties of education: external factors such as the demands of society, the politics of education, the impact of technology, demographics, employment of faculty graduates in society, and conditions and expectations to be met in the K-12 system; internal-external factors such as relationships with other faculties in the university, relationships with other agencies in the educational system, the demands of the profession and control of decision-making; and internal aspects including

faculty and individual autonomy, faculty mission, departmentalization, faculty resources, and faculty evaluation. The Review also dealt with programs in faculties of education, involvement of other faculties, practicum experiences, the theory-practice bridge, inservice education, the impact of research, and the nature of teacher education curricula. Finally, this Review summarized a few general statements on teacher education reform in The United States and Canada. All this provided to task forces and study teams the background information to expand their own special interest and apply them to the subjects that they were considering in Phase 3.

The second Phase was to identify issues facing the Faculty based on the information derived from the first Phase. The first step of this Phase was to gather reactions and concerns by interviewing faculty members. Eighteen interviewers were selected among the faculty members and were oriented and instructed by the Coordinators. They were trained in interview strategies by an expert on research methodology. More than ninety percent of the Faculty members were interviewed. They were asked to (1) comment on discrepancies between the information in the Report: *The Dynamics of Diversity* and the interviewee's perception on the Faculty; (2) describe strengths, concerns, and desirable future changes; and (3) identify matters of significant concern. The responses reported by the interviewers were summarized and classified. All responses for each question were classified into categories and examined by the Project Team. The resulting summary analysis was organized on the basis of the topics or questions outlined in the interview guide. The perceived strengths, concerns, and changes as interpreted and categorized by the Project Coordinators were listed in order of frequency of mention. Any pervasive themes or generalizations were avoided and left for the Issue Identification Panel and the individual Faculty members to make.

In the second step of Phase 2, a twelve-member Issue Identification Panel (eight experts from outside the Faculty and four from within) was created to translate (1) the concerns and views of Faculty members and stakeholders, (2) the Faculty's structure and

operations, and (3) the knowledge gained from the literature and of the Panel members, into "Issues". Each panel member identified five issues facing the Faculty. These issue statements were then collated, categorized, and summarized by the Project Team into seven issue areas: (1) the nature of teaching and the teaching profession, (2) the nature of the teacher education program, (3) a professional school within a university community, (4) mission and goals of the faculty, (5) enrollment management, (6) faculty structure, organization, and procedures, and (7) relationships with and responsibilities to the field of practice. These seven issue areas were discussed in a two-day Issue Identification Seminar by the members of Issue Identification Panel. Eventually, all the issues were categorized into three issue areas including 11 sub-issues: 1) models of teacher preparation programs; 2) development and maintenance of high standards of student admission and performance; 3) the nature and role of field experiences in the teacher education program; 4) planning, implementing, and evaluating the teacher preparation program; 5) the role of graduate studies within the Faculty geared to continuing education; 6) appropriate research and scholarly activity for a professional faculty; 7) to define and implement faculty leadership/service role; 8) to clarify mission and goals, and priorities; 9) the type of organization to ensure goal achievement; 10) the rewards system; and 11) the operational procedures of the Faculty.

All these issues were elaborated and reported in the resulting issues statement. It was distributed to all faculty members and stakeholder groups to seek their assistance in clarifying the issues and in identifying the high-priority ones so as to initiate the issue resolution.

In the last step of Phase 2, four Issue Identification Feedback Forums were held, seventy-one Faculty members and representatives of stakeholder groups attended. At the Forums, small groups of participants discussed issues and key questions which they felt ought to be given priority. Following this, each participant was given a Response Form on which to indicate their personal selection of four high and four low priority issues, and key

questions for the high priority issues. Sixty-six Response Forms were completed and then they were analyzed by the Project Coordinators later. The final decision was made to concentrate on: (1) Faculty mission, goals, and priorities, (2) Models and frameworks for organizing teacher education programs, (3) Faculty organization and procedures, and (4) Graduate studies and research. All these issues selected were addressed by two Task Forces and two Study Teams in Phase 3.

In Phase 3 the Coordinators chose the Task Force and Study Team leaders in consultation with the Dean. They left the leaders to select the other members of the Task Forces and Study Teams. The leaders had chosen people who represented different kinds of interests and with whom they were willing to work. All the members were well acquainted with their specific tasks, issues to be investigated, questions to address, procedures, resources, and time limits.

The six-member Task Force on Mission, Goals, and Priorities was assigned to develop alternative missions and sets of goals and priorities for the Faculty. They began by reviewing the literature on mission statements in the planning process and examining examples of mission statements developed by other universities. They had learned that a university faculty was not the best place to be dealing with mission statements. Then, they reviewed the University planning document, "The Next Decade and Beyond" and got a sense of where the University was trying to go. The University has three kinds of missions: teaching, research, and service. Based on this trinity of university functions, the Task Force was broken up into three groups and produced three mission statements: the Faculty as traditional expert; the Faculty as servant to society; and the Faculty as academic entrepreneur. They circulated the three mission statements to the entire Faculty and the ATA reaction panel which served as a "sounding board" for the Task Force's ideas as they developed. They set up a forum and invited people to come to make representations to them. They also sought advice from experts outside the Faculty. They kept discussing, criticizing, revising, and rewriting, until the mission statement was arrived at: The

University of Alberta Faculty of Education is the professional faculty for the teaching profession; teaching and learning are at the heart of its work. This responsibility was fulfilled in a number of ways which were identified as goals.

The ten-member Task Force on Teacher Education Models was assigned to develop alternative models for the preparation of teachers. They began by studying the materials on teacher education models gathered from twelve North American universities. They explored the literature in teacher education which led to the conclusion that there was very little substance associated with claims about the efficacy of innovative advances in teacher education. Their meetings turned out to be seminars where they debated back and forth. They also examined the current programs of teacher education at the University of Alberta in terms of the participants' reactions and criticisms and finally settled on the Concerns Based Model and the Critically Reflective Model. Both models had important implications for the design and sequencing of teacher education programs. Based on these two models, the Task Force eventually recommended a blending of the two approaches that teacher education should be based upon reflection-in-action.

The three-member Study Team on Organization and Procedures was assigned to prepare background papers to assist the task force which would be established in developing and considering the feasibility of alternative organizational structures and operating procedures. They started with a series of discussions and had identified the major topics concerning the organizational structure of faculties of education, the nature of the practice in which professors of education engaged, and the operation of reward systems. Then, they examined the available reports on the organizational structure of a number of faculties of education and summarized the procedures of their promotion and performance assessment procedures. They also carried out a literature review on the administration of faculties of education and had identified the conceptual point of departure for the consideration of organizational issues. However, the practices elsewhere and literature still held limited potential as aids to addressing the issues manifested in the

particular conditions of this Faculty. Therefore, two studies were conducted by this Study Team in the Faculty of Education, one was interviews with administrators of the Faculty and the other, a questionnaire survey of the Faculty members. Finally they identified the major issues: (1) dynamic tensions between structural units, levels, roles, and processes; (2) reconciling and balancing opposing and contradictory forces; (3) tension between Faculty and departments; 4) responsibility for planning, implementing, and evaluating the teacher education program at the Faculty level; and (5) The tension between individual and organization. They then suggested some resolutions.

The major task assigned to the three-member Study Team on Graduate Studies and Research was to prepare background papers to assist the future task force in developing and considering the feasibility of alternative roles for the Faculty with respect to graduate studies and research. They first began by reviewing four categories of the related literature: Documents of the Strategic Planning Project; Reports on the current status of the Faculty; Available documents related to research activities within the Faculty; and Literature on profiles of productive researchers, age and faculty productivity, graduate programs, general references related to faculties of education. Secondly, they conducted interviews with several informants selected to represent a small cross-section of those with a vested interest in the Faculty, ranging from Faculty members representing each academic rank to senior department, Faculty, and library administrators. Thirdly, together with the Study Team on Organization and Procedures, this Study Team conducted a faculty survey which took the form of an opinion questionnaire designed to elicit information on staff perceptions of their working environment. Therefore, three major findings were presented in this study team's final report: (1) The faculty was expected to exhibit leadership on several fronts of research; (2) Staff needed to be encouraged to combine teaching and research; and (3) The form of graduate programs would remain to be decided based on the mission statement.

During the whole Phase 3, these Task Forces and Study Teams worked in collaboration with one another and with the Coordinators of the Project. By-weekly

regular meetings of the task force and study team leaders and the Project Coordinators were held to consider problems, report on progress, and share ideas. Three all-member seminars were held and the Dean was present at all of these seminars.

The final report of each Task Force and Study Team was presented to the Project Coordinators by late December of 1988. There were several major differences from the original plans. First, the final report was overdue. Second, no more than one alternative model was developed by the Task Forces. Third, the Study Team reports were more like the Task Force reports than was originally intended.

After the finalization of the Reports of the two Task Forces and two Study Teams by the end of 1988, the Project Coordinator in late January, 1989, prepared a report to the Dean, which included implications and 12 recommendations made by the Project Coordinator for the final phase of the Strategic Planning Project--taking action. Then the Dean approved the Report and wrote a "Forward" and "An Analysis of the Task Force and Study Team Reports" for the final Report. At last, in February of 1989, the final Report of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, entitled *Exploring and Mapping the Future: A Focus on Priority Issues--A Report on Alternatives for Issue Resolution by the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project* was distributed to faculty members and stakeholder groups.

In Phase 4, due to the retirement of the Coordinators, the Dean was fully responsible for the process of the action planning. The Dean's proposed planning for action included: (1) Setting up a continuous and ongoing process to carry out the action plan and attack one of the identified issues every year; (2) Keeping Task Force and Study Team leaders to play a more important role; (3) Using the formal organizational structure of the Faculty for implementing the action plan, such as line administrators, department chairs, Faculty of Education Council, etc.; and (4) Encouraging heavier involvement of the faculty members and stakeholder groups.

With regard to the approaches employed especially in the first three phases of the project, the researcher perceived that they were all the same: a literature review, documental review, and interviews, then analyzing the data, and finally, reporting. It seemed that the committees, sub-committees, Panel, task forces and study teams did a lot of repetitious and time-consuming work. And most of those people who were involved in those group activities spent innumerable time on that paper work--the various kinds of reports. As for the procedures of the Project, it is quite clear that a set of systematic traditional planning procedures was used: taking stock of current conditions; identifying issue areas for change; developing alternative solutions; and implementing the solutions. These were the same procedures used by the organizational renewal model and recommended in the organizational development literature.

In terms of the outcomes of the Project, from the perspective of many of the informants, the Project would not stimulate departments to change and any change in the Faculty would be minimal and slow. Many informants felt pessimistic about the future of the Project and believed that the Faculty would continue the old road. Many informants believed that the university context, tradition, and culture make change unlikely.

With regard to participation, during every phase of the Project, Faculty members and representatives from stakeholder groups were given opportunities for involvement through interviews, oral and written responses to reports, and attendance at feedback forums. In Phase 1, fourteen faculty members, mostly, administrators, and fourteen people from stakeholder groups were interviewed for the Faculty Current Status and Trends Study. In Phase 2, ninety-one percent of the total Faculty were interviewed by eighteen faculty members who worked as interviewers gathering feedback on the Current Status and Trends Study. Also in this Phase, eight experts from outside the Faculty worked on Panels to help the Faculty identify issues. Four Issue Identification Feedback Forums were held and seventy-one people altogether attended, including people from stakeholder groups. In Phase 3, eighteen faculty members and one stakeholder

representative were appointed to work for the Task Forces and Study Teams. During this Phase, there was very low faculty attendance in the forums on discussing the Mission Statement of the Faculty held by the Task Force on Mission and Goals. Sixty-three faculty members participated in the Survey on Work and Rewards held by the Study Teams on Structure and Procedures and on Graduate Studies and Research. In Phase 4, around sixty faculty members attended the two Faculty of Education Councils each time to discuss the Reports on Mission and Goals Statements and the Alternative Models on Teacher Education respectively.

Informants who were heavily involved in the Project considered that the involvement of faculty members at different stages was high; at some other times the level of involvement was varied, but that was by their own choice, it was not for a lack of opportunity. In contrast to this, some informants indicated that their involvement was insufficient and peripheral and some of their input was excluded. Some informants saw the involvement of the faculty as window dressing and merely symbolic. Many informants perceived that the interest and enthusiasm of the faculty in the Project declined quickly because the Project had low profile, visibility, and incentives and was too general and mistimed. With regard to selecting people outside and inside the Faculty to participate in the various committees, some informants believed that the selection was based on the participants' experience and expertise. In contrast, some other informants perceived the selection to be based on personality, friendship ties, and convenience.

Reflecting upon the process and issues involved in the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project, four themes are identified in relation to the literature on strategic planning. They are Models: Strategic Planning versus Traditional Planning; Leadership: Aspiration versus Actuality; Involvement: Participation versus Frustration; and Culture: Institutional versus Strategic.

The model followed by this Project can be perceived as a traditional planning model because of its internal focus, inadequate environmental scan, and a lack of identification of strategic issues.

The leadership of the Faculty had neither developed a thorough understanding of the Strategic Planning Project among the Faculty nor sold the framework of strategic planning within the political context of the Faculty. The Dean of the Faculty delegated the decision making of the Project to two faculty members (Project Coordinators) and worked as a "front man" for them while he was facing dilemmas of whether to develop or impose a Faculty mission, how to link strategic planning with budgeting, and how to balance centralized decision-making and participative decision-making.

The reasons for the declining faculty participation in the Strategic Planning Project were identified as the Project's low visibility, extended time-line, lack of incentive, and surface involvement.

The institutional culture in universities which includes consensus and collegial models, "organized anarchy", loose coupling, individualism, professional autonomy, the lack of common goals and vision, the lack of competitors, and a slow response to their environments conflicts with strategic culture. Institutional tradition and inertia were identified as the major barriers in carrying out strategic planning in the university context.

In order to make strategic planning successful, the chief administrators must understand the difference between traditional planning and strategic planning, have a full commitment to strategic planning, encourage faculty participation, and develop an appropriate strategic planning culture. The major obstacles for carrying out strategic planning are also identified: (1) the influence of the way of traditional planning; (2) the dilemma facing the leadership and their styles and skills; (3) the lack of strategies to motivate faculty involvement; and (4) institutional inertia and tradition.

Personal Reflections

The major themes/issues which emerged from the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project remind the researcher of *The Art of Strategy*. It was written by Sun Tzu, a strategist and philosopher, more than twenty-three centuries ago. In his book, Sun Tzu repeatedly emphasized the five fundamentals in "calculating a plan". He stated:

Strategy is the great work of the organization. In Situation of life or death, it is the Tao of survival or extinction. Its study cannot be neglected.

Therefore, Calculate a plan with Five Working Fundamentals, and examine the condition of each. The first is Tao. The second is Nature. The third is Situation. The fourth is Leadership. The fifth is Art.

The Tao inspires people to share in the same ideals and expectations. Hence, because they share in life and share in death, the people do not fear Danger.

Nature is the dark and light, the cold and hot, and the Systems of Time.

Situation is the distant or immediate, the obstructed or easy, the broad or narrow, and the Chances of life or death.

Leadership is Intelligence, Credibility, Humanity, Courage, and Discipline.

The Art is a flexible System wherein the View and its Officials employ the Tao.

Leaders should not be unfamiliar with these Five. Those who understand them will triumph. Those who do not understand them will be defeated (Translated by Wing, 1988, p. 21).

Here, the researcher intends to give a further explanation of the five fundamentals in order to give readers a better understanding of the translation of the ancient Chinese: Tao means Vision, Commitment, and Culture; Nature means Seasons and Time; Situation means Environment and Opportunity; Leadership means Ability and Style; and Art means Strategies which fit the vision and culture of the organization.

It is important to point out that Sun Tzu wrote this book sometime during the Warring States period (480 B.C. to 221 B.C.) within which more than three hundred wars

were fought between the warlords, among the separated states, and against the ruling dynasty, the Chou. Therefore, planning, organizing, and positioning resources strategically were most essential to achieve the victory. Today, although the chariots and crossbows are gone, the contradiction and conflict, internationally and nationally, worldwide and locally, are exactly the same: a struggle for ideological supremacy and the control of resources.

Looking at the Faculty of Education, it is surrounded by the supra-environment: a democratic, heterogeneous, and free-will society, and it is embedded in its parent organization, the University of Alberta, which is governed by two systems: a collegial committee system superimposed upon a bureaucratic system. Within the Faculty, a dual structure: the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research and the Faculty itself, each focuses on a competing set of values. Besides, six departments enjoy and exercise a large degree of autonomy and a large degree of influence in faculty governance. This idea was captured well by an informant who perceived that the Faculty was organized as "a feudal realm in which the Dean is like the King--not a strong King--who is surrounded by strong feudal lords, the department chairs." The Faculty was also described as "a collectivity of largely autonomous professionals and academics brought together for selected purposes into departments" and as "a federal state, a confederation of principalities, with limited means to influence the activity of individuals and departments."

Under such a contradictory situation, one can imagine how difficult it could be to carry out comprehensive strategic planning in this complex institution. This situation requires the Dean to be a symbolic leader who seeks to develop a consensus as to a vision of the total organization and the people's role in it, a vision to which they will personally commit themselves because they share and support the mission and the values of the institution. On the other hand, the Dean must show cultural leadership and focus on developing a powerful organizational culture in which people believe strongly, with which to identify personally, and to which they gladly render their loyalty.

When the researcher did his Master's thesis, he interviewed more than ten university administrators including presidents and deans of faculties. When he did his research project on the governance of Indiana University in the United States, he interviewed more than twenty chief administrators at university and faculty levels. And during this study, he, again interviewed some administrators at faculty and department levels. From all these interviews, the researcher has obtained a sense that decision making and planning in the university setting are very tough challenges for the chief administrators. Theoretically, a problematic situation can be dealt with using the concepts and models of organization theory. However, practically, it is hard to say which concept can work because of the situational contingencies and the skill and style of the leadership. There is no one universal, best way to exercise leadership under all conditions. It is necessary, therefore, to assess the situational contingencies in selecting a style of leadership behavior.

However, from the researcher's perspective, Sun Tzu's five fundamentals in planning are quite appropriate, whether from the point of view of the West or East. In order to have a successful plan, the leaders have to develop a strategic vision and culture (Tao) to share with the people; they must choose the right time to take action (Nature); they should be risk-taking and can not afford to miss a good opportunity (Situation); they must be intelligent, credible, humanitarian, courageous, and impose discipline, if necessary (Leadership); and they must employ strategies flexibly and wisely to achieve organizational goals (Art).

In his recent research, Shirley (1988) indicates that a strategic planning effort begins with the design of a strategic vision which he holds to be the key function of the university top leadership. Defining an institution's basic mission and its target audiences, determining the desired program mix and the institution's comparative market advantage, and specifying the actions required to achieve goals are all part of creating a strategic vision. Matching internal strengths to opportunities lying in the external environment is crucial in conceiving a strategy. The planning must then be put in operation, which

involves the completion of congruent plans in the operating units, the departments. Not surprisingly, Shirley's viewpoints match harmoniously with Sun Tzu's five fundamentals in planning.

Keller (1983) proposed a management approach attuned to the requirements of the times. It encouraged academics to consider the concept of strategic planning. Unlike traditional long term planning, which typically projects model institutional futures based on linear extrapolations from the past, strategic planning is essentially action-oriented. Although it also addresses longer term goals, it emphasizes actions to be taken in the shorter term, often a year to two years at most. It is a systematic approach based on assessing the institution's strengths and weaknesses and the threats and opportunities existing in the external environment that allows the leadership to make decisions of action about mission, goals, and priorities in the right time. It is clear that Keller's approach also matches Sun Tzu's second fundamental, Nature (time), the third, Situation (opportunity), and the fifth, Art (flexible strategies to achieve goals).

Lisenky (1988) contends that the most important strategy in carrying out strategic planning is to integrate strategic planning with an institution's control systems. The major control system is budgeting which can prioritize allocation of resources in line with planning goals. Others, like the information system, reward system, and procedures for meshing a unit plan with the overall strategic plan are also vital control devices. Beyond this, Lisenky believes a strong leadership must respect the prevailing institutional culture in making use of control systems to promote a consensus of vision. This one is closely related to Sun Tzu's fifth fundamental: Art, using the system and strategies flexibly which fit the organization's culture.

Roach (1988) emphasizes that a full leadership commitment to strategic planning is essential for success, no matter which planning model is adopted. Successful strategic planning illustrates the close linkage between administration, which aims to do things right, and leadership, which seeks to do the right things. The leadership must ensure that the

institution and its goals converge and must make strategic planning an integral part of the institutional culture. Basically, Roach points out the importance of visionary and cultural leadership. This refers to Sun Tzu's fourth fundamental: leadership skill and style.

Cyert (1988) points out in his case study that the university is a decentralized organization, and it must be managed that way. However, when a decentralized organization is operated without any central leadership, difficulties and conflicts arise. Therefore, without the discipline imposed on the institution from the central leadership, strategic planning will never take place at all. Planning forces the people in the institution to deal with an ambiguous future. Many faculty members are by nature averse to risk and uncertainty. Many of them have moved into university academic life because they want certainty and security. Therefore, a strong visionary and action-oriented leadership is needed to impose discipline, if necessary. Brown (1988) holds that the foremost responsibility of top leadership is to articulate and inspire with zeal a vision of what the institution is becoming and to employ strategies to accomplish it. Visionary leadership with zeal, whether from an individual or from a group, demands the courage to risk for high achievements and with consistency that enables distinctive excellence. Chaffee and Tierney (1988) view strategy as "a way of looking, listening, and thinking" (p. 22) and Weick (1985) posits that the concepts of strategic planning and culture may be asymmetrically substitutable. He states, "Culture can substitute for plans more effectively than plans for culture" (p. 383). Therefore, strategic planning needs cultural leadership. The leader must also be an educator, looking, listening, thinking, broadcasting, encouraging, and moving people of the institution to expend energy, wisdom, and ingenuity toward achieving the vision.

In sum, all these in the above paragraph indicate that a strong leadership must have intelligence, credibility, humanity, courage and discipline, just as Sun Tzu mentioned in his fourth fundamental: leadership style and skill.

From Sun Tzu to current strategic planning analysts; from the Art of Strategy to strategic management; from 200 B.C. to 2000 A.D.; from ancient China to modern Canada; and from warlords' battlefields to a higher educational institution, the five fundamentals have been commonly exercised by the leadership in carrying out planning. Since the most important reason for the leadership of the Faculty of Education to establish the strategic planning project is to build Faculty level commitment and to develop a commonly held vision and culture, this reflection could provide some help to the leadership of the Faculty in looking at leadership style and combining the strategies of the ancient and present strategists to fulfill the institutional goals.

Implications for Practice

The following implications for educational administrators in the future practice of strategic planning were derived from the findings of the study.

First of all, before starting strategic planning, chief administrators should develop a thorough understanding of the role of strategic planning and its differences from traditional planning. Strategic planning is built on an institutional culture, it is necessary to develop an organizational climate which fits the institution's culture and encourages flexibility and leads to a contingency-strategic way of thinking. The framework of strategic planning must be "sold" within the political context of the institution so that all participants can recognize the possibility that their programs can benefit from it and, as a result, create a suitable environment to support it.

Second, strategic planning is commonly considered the primary function of chief administrators. The essential decisions about the institution's future--the articulation of the institution's mission, an unified vision for the future, and the overall internal planning assumptions--can be made by a few chief administrators with the support of a central planning staff. Although centralized decision making goes against the collegiate model and

participative decision-making, it tends to ignore detailed, laborious, and time-consuming steps. Chief administrators should bear the organizational balance in mind, that is, to keep the balance between top-down and bottom-up approaches in decision-making. Decisions such as action plans and strategies in implementing the plans should be generated through a decentralized process to instill a sense of ownership and commitment to strategic planning.

Third, chief administrators should make the planning process open and accessible to all who have a legitimate need to participate and take steps to ensure that the best, most self-confident, most imaginative faculty, staff, students, and administrators are appointed to the various planning committees. The selection of people to work for the planning committees through personal friendship ties can isolate the committees from colleagues and peers.

Fourth, according to Chaffee's (1984) "interpretive" model, an organization is a network of self-interested participants. In such a model, successful strategic planning requires skillful use of all forms of communication and of the symbols used to portray the collective reality of participants--the management of meaning. The planning agenda must have a direct bearing on the motivation system. Chief administrators should create and develop a climate for change and open dialogue in order to broaden faculty participation and build a common understanding of institutional purposes. Consultations and communications should be conducted in formal and informal settings. Multiple approaches, compatible with the subculture existing within the academic units, are essential for increasing faculty involvement. Different strategies should be used to lead to different types and levels of faculty participation in the process of strategic planning. Some strategies encourage direct and active participation of faculty members; some broaden the base of faculty involvement; some are crucial at the initial stage; and some are only employed at the implementation stage. Each strategy should present different incentives for different groups of participants.

Finally, line managers must be heavily involved in the process of strategic planning and must be provided with necessary objectives and assumptions by chief administrators. The strategic planning process must be inextricably linked with other managerial processes within the institution. The structure for strategic planning should not be separate from the formal organizational structure of the institution. The framework of strategic planning that is developed must be realistic and capable of being implemented. The procedures in carrying out the strategic planning should be flexible, and simple and repetitious work should be avoided. Timing is important in planning and a two- to three-year timeline is highly recommended.

Implications for Further Research

This chapter concludes with a discussion of implications for further research. The findings of this study relating to whether the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project is a strategic planning practice or rational planned change effort provides a number of areas for continued research.

First, this study was delimited to one faculty which is embedded in its parent organization--the university. A multi-site case study on strategic planning processes in other university settings in Canada could extend the understandings of effective procedures and approaches, models, leadership role, nature of involvement, and barriers to strategic planning.

Second, since the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project has not been completed, continued research is needed to track the final outcomes. If it were successful, an inquiry is needed to investigate its last phase such as action taken, strategies employed, leadership function, and so on. If it were not a success, the barriers need to be investigated and the pitfalls need to be identified.

Third, organizational culture is one of the most influential factors in strategic planning. A study is needed to investigate to what extent the organizational culture is a supportive factor to strategic planning and the reasons can be identified; if the organizational culture is an obstacle, then the investigation can focus upon how to overcome the barriers in such a way as to create a culture to fit strategic planning, and also to specify a cultural leadership style.

Fourth, Chan (1988) indicates that the literature on effective and desirable ways to involve faculty in strategic planning in higher education institutions is still at the developmental stage (p. 19). Therefore, a multi-case study on faculty involvement in strategic planning and its advantages and disadvantages to strategic planning would be an important area of study.

Finally, a multi-case study on the influence of the leadership background, experience, personality, style, expertise, and adaptive ability on strategic planning would be necessary research to provide administrators with basic information on how to fit strategic planning to their own leadership ability and style.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackoff, R. L. (1981). On the use of models in corporate planning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2, 353-359.
- Albanese, R. (1975). *Management: Toward accountability for performance*. Homewood IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Allen, L. A. (1982). *Making managerial planning more effective*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Allen, R., & Chaffee, E. E. (1981). *Management fads in higher education*, NCHEMS Monograph No. 3, Boulder, Co: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Allison, G. (1974). *The essence of decision*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Ang, J. S., & Chua, J. H. (1979). Long range planning in large United States corporations--A survey. *Long Range Planning*, 12 (2), 99-102.
- Ansoff, H. I. (1977). State of management in planning systems. *Sloan Management Review*, 18, 11-24.
- Apps, J. W. (1988). *Higher education in a learning society*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ary, Donald. (1985). *Introduction to research in education*. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Ashley, W. C. (1983). Issues management -- new tool for new times. *Bank Marketing* 15, 10-14.
- Austin, A. E., and Gamson, Z. F. (1983). *Academic work place: new demands, heightened tensions*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. ED 243 397. 131 pp.
- Bailey, K. D. (1982). *Methods of social research*. New York: Free Press.
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. L. (1978). *Policy making and effective leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., and Riley, G. L. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education in *Governing Academic Organization* by G.L. Riley and J.V. Baldrige. Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Baldrige, J. V., and Okimi, P. H. (1982). Strategic planning in higher education: New tool or old gimmick? *American Association for Higher Education bulletin*, 35 (2), 6-18.
- Baldrige, J. V., & Deal, T. (1983). *The dynamics of organizational change in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

- Bazziz, S. J., & Grinyer, P. H. (1981). Corporate planning in the U.K.: The state of the art in the 70s. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2, 155-68.
- Beauchamp, L., et al. (1989). Task forces on teacher education models--final report in *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education. University of Alberta.
- Becher, T. (1981). Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6 (2), 109-22.
- Belohlav, J. A., & Waggener, H. (1980). Keep the "strategic" in your strategic planning. *Managerial Planning*, 28 (5), 23-25.
- Blyn, M. R. & Zoerner, C. E. Jr. (1982). The academic string-pushers: the origins of the up-coming crisis is the management of academia. *Change*, 14, 21-25.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boulton, W. R., Lindsay, W. M., Franklin, S. G., & Rue, L. (1982). Strategic planning: determining the impact of environmental characteristics and uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25 (3), 500-509.
- Bourgeois, L. J. (1980). Strategy and environment: A conceptual integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 5 (1), 25-39.
- Bradford, D. C., & Cohen, A. R. (1984). *Managing for excellence: The guide to developing higher performance in contemporary organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Bresser, R. K., & Bishop, R. C. (1983). Dysfunctional effects of formal planning: Two theoretical explanations. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 588-599.
- Brown, D. G. (1988). The university of North Carolina at Asheville in *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, edited by D. W. Steeples. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Bryson, J. M. (1988). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Burrell, Gibson, & Morgan, Gareth. (1974). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. New Hampshire: Heinemann.
- Cameron, Kim. (1980). Critical questions in assessing organizational effectiveness in *Organizational Dynamics*. AMACOM, a division of American Management Associations.
- Chaffee, E. E. (1985a). The concept of strategy: from business to higher education. In Smart, J.C.(ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research*. New York: Agathon.
- Chaffee, E. E. (1985b). Three models of strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 10 (1): 89-98.

- Chaffee, E. E. (1984). Successful strategic management in small private colleges. *Journal of Higher Education*, 55 (2), 212-41.
- Chaffee, E. E. (1983). *Rational decision making in higher education*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Chaffee, E. E. & Tierney, W. G. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: Macmillan.
- Chan, S. S. (1986, June). *Making strategic planning work: Experience from a private university*. Paper presented at the association for International Research Association Annual Forum, Orlando.
- Chan, S. S. (1988). Faculty participation in strategic planning: Incentives and strategies. *Planning for Higher Education*, 16 (2), 19-30.
- Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cleveland, H. (1985). *The knowledge for executive: Leadership in an information society*. New York: Dutton.
- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cope, R. G. (1978). *Strategic policy planning: A guide for college and university administrators*. Littleton CO: Ireland Educational Corporation.
- Cope, R. G. (1981). Strategic planning, management, and decision making. *AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report*, No. 9. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Cope, R. G. (1985). A contextual model to encompass the strategic planning concept: introducing a newer paradigm. *Planning for higher education*, 13 (3), 13-20.
- Cope, R. G. (1987). Opportunity from strength: strategic planning clarified with case examples. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports 1987*, 8. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Cyert, R. M. (1988). Carnegie Mellon University. In *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, edited by D. W. Steeples. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Daft, R. L., & Weick, K. E. (1984). Toward a model of organizations as interpretation systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 284-296.
- Day, G. S. (1984). *Strategic market planning*. New York: West Publishing Company.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *Sociological methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Deutsch, J. M. (1983). Retrenchment: Crisis or challenge? *Educational Record* (Winter 1983), 41-44.
- Dexter, L. A. (1970). *Elite and specialized interviewing*. Evanston Press, IL: Northwestern University.

- Dickmeyer, N., & Hughes, K. S. (1980). *Financial self-assessment: A workbook for colleges*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for College and University Business Officers.
- Diffenbach, J. (1983). Corporate environmental analysis in large U.S. corporations. *Long Range Planning*, 16 (6), 107-16.
- Doyle, P., & Lynch, J. E. (1976). Long range planning for universities. *Long Range Planning*, 9, 39-46.
- Drucker, P. (1980). *Management in turbulent times*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dutton, J. E. (1987). Perspectives on strategic issue processing: Insights from a case study. In Lamb, R. & Shrivastava, P. (eds.). *Advances in strategic management*. Greenwich: JAI, CT, 5.
- Dutton, J. L., Fahey, L., & Narayanan, V. K. (1983). Toward understanding strategic issue diagnosis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4, 297-323.
- Dutton, J. E., & Duncan, R. B. (1987). The influence of the strategic planning process on strategic change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8, 103-116.
- Dykes, A. B. (1968). *Faculty participation in academic decision making*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Ewell, P. T., and Chaffee, E. E. (1981). *Promoting the effective use of information in decision making*. NCHEMS Monograph No. 4, Boulder, CO. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Fishburne, G., et al. (1989). Study team on graduate studies and research--final report in *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education. University of Alberta.
- Floyd, C. E. (1985). *Faculty participation in decision making: necessity or luxury?* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Fomburn, C., & Astley, W. G. (1983). Beyond corporate strategy. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 4 (2), 47-54.
- Foot II, E. T. (1988). The University of Miami. In *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, edited by D. W. Steeples. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: a stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Glenny, L. A. (1976). *Presidents confront reality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gluck, W. J. (1975). Strategic planning--why and how. *The Ontario Council for Leadership in Educational Administration*, Sept, 1975, 11-13

- Glueck, W. F. (1980). *Business policy and strategic planning management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Godiwalla, Y. M., Meinhart, W. A., & Warde, W. D. (1980). Environmental scanning--does it help the chief executive? *Long Range Planning*, 13 (5), 87-99.
- Goodman, P. S. (1982). *Change in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grant, J. H., & King, W. R. (1979). Strategy formulation: Analytical and normative models. In Schendel, D. E., & Hofer, C. W. (eds.), *Strategic Management: A new view of business policy and planning*. Boston: Little, Brown. 104-22.
- Grinyer, P. H., & Norbern, D. (1974). Strategic planning in 21 U.K. companies. *Long Range Planning*, 7 (4), 80-88.
- Guba, E. G. (1980). *Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries*. Paper presented at a Qualitative Research Seminar, University of Alberta, Edmonton, May.
- Guba, E. G. (1985). *Organization theory and inquiry: the paradigm revolution*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guide. (1986). For interviews collecting data for the Current Status and Trends Study. Unpublished document. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Hanson, E. M. (1979). *Educational administration and organizational behavior*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Harman, K. M. (1989). Culture and conflict in academic organization: Symbolic aspects of university worlds. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 27 (3), 30-54.
- Harrison, M. I. (1987). *Diagnosing organizations*. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.
- Hayes, R. H. (1986, April 20). Why strategic planning goes awry? *The New York Times*.
- Heger, H. K. (1982). Revolution in the small colleges. *Educational Record*. (Fall 1982), 18-19.
- Heist, P., & Warren, J. R. (1975). *Responding to changing human resource needs*. New Directions for Institutional Research Series, No. 7. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Henry, H. W. (1980). Appraising company's strengths and weaknesses. *Managerial Planning*, 28 (2), 31-36.
- Herriot, R. E., & Gross, N. (1979). *The dynamics of planned educational change*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Hofferbert, R. I. (1974). *The study of public policy*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Hollowood, J. R. (1979). *College and university strategic planning: a methodological approach*. Cambridge, MA: Arthur D. Little.

- Hrynyk, N. (1987). *Issues in teacher education: a review of literature*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E., McIntosh, R. G., & Worth, W. H. (1985). *Faculty of Education self study proposed design*. Unpublished document. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E. (1987). *Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Study Design*. Unpublished document. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E., & Worth, J. (1986). *Issues identification procedures: orientation to panel members*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E., & Worth, J. (1987a). *Issues facing the Faculty of Education*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E., & Worth, J. (1987b). *Issues identification feedback forums*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E., & Worth, J. (1987c). *Report of interviews with faculty members: a working paper*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E., & Worth, J. (1987d). *Terms of reference for task forces and study teams*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Ingram, E. (1989). Approaches to issue resolution in *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education. University of Alberta.
- Jick, D. T. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602-611.
- Jones, L. W. (1990). Strategic planning: the unrealized potential of the 1980s and the promise of the 1990s. *New Directions for Higher Education*, no 24, 51-57. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jonsen, R. W. (1986). The environmental context for postsecondary education in *Environmental scanning for strategic leadership*, P. M. Callan (ed.), New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 52, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Winter 1986.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters: innovation for productivity in the American corporation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: the management revolution in higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1967). *Foundations of behavioral research* (2rd. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kotler, P., & Murphy, P. E. (1981). Strategic planning for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 52 (5), 470.

- Kotler, P., & Fox, K. F. A. (1985). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lawler, E. E., Nadler, D. A., & Cammann, C. (1980). *Organizational assessment: perspectives on the measurement of organizational behavior and the quality of work life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lee, S. M., & Van Horn, J. C. (1983). *Academic administration: planning, budgeting, and decision making with multiple objectives*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Leontiades, M. (1982). The confusing words of business policy. *Academy of Management Review*, 7 (1), 45-48.
- Lewis, J. L. Jr. (1983). *Long-range and short-range planning for educational administrators*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lindquist, J. (1978). *Strategies for change*. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Sounding Press.
- Lindsay, W. M., & Rue, L. W. (1980). Impact of organizational environment on the long-range planning process: a contingency view. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (2), 385-404.
- Lisensky, R. P. (1988). Integrating the control systems. In *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, edited by D. W. Steeples. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Lorange, P. (1982). *Implementation of strategic planning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Lorange, P. (1979). Formal planning systems: Their role in strategy formulation and implementation. In Schendel, D.E. & Hofer, C.W. (eds.), *Strategic management*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Lozier, G. G., & Chittipeddi, K. (1986). Issues management in strategic planning. *Research in Higher Education*, 24 (1), 3-14.
- Lucas, J. A. (1979). *Developing a total marketing plan*. New Directions for Institutional Research Series. No. 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lyles, M. A., & Lenz, R. T. (1982). Managing the planning process: A field study of the human side of planning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3, 105-118.
- Mangham, I. L. (1982). The performers: higher education as theatre. In Gray, H.L. (ed.) *The management of educational institutions*. Barcombe, Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Mayhew, L. B. (1979). *Surviving the eighties: strategies and procedures for solving fiscal and enrollment problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCall, G. J., & Simons, L. L. (1969). *Issues in participant observation*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- McGinnis, M. A. (1984). The key to strategic planning: Integrating analysis and intuition. *Sloan Management Review*, 24, 45-52.

- McIntosh, G. (1987). *The dynamics of diversity: the Faculty of Education in context*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Merriam, B. (1985). The case study in educational research: a review of selected literature. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 19, 3.
- Miklos, E, Greene, M., & Conklin, R. (1987). *Teachers' evaluation of their preparation for teaching* (Report prepared by the Committee on Evaluating Teacher Education Programs). Edmonton, AB: Alberta Teachers' Association.
- Miklos, E., Browne, M. P., & Stewin, L. L. (1988). *Faculty members' view on selected aspects of work and reward structure*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Miklos, E., et al. (1989). Study team on organization and operational procedures--final report in *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1977). Policy as a field of management theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 2 (1), 88-103.
- Mishra, Kalpana. (1986). *Adaptation to environmental pressures in a teacher education organization*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Education, Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors and puzzle solving in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 605-622.
- Morrison, J. L., Renfro, W. L., & Boucher, W. I. (1984). *Futures research and the strategic planning process: implications for higher education*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Nadler, G. & Bozeman, W. C. (1983). The relationship of planning and knowledge synthesis. In S. A. Ward and L.J. Reed (Eds.), *Knowledge structure and use: implications for synthesis and interpretation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Naylor, T. H. (1979). *Corporate planning models*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Newman, W. H., & Wallender, H. W. (1978). Managing not-for-profit enterprises. *Academy of Management Review*, 3, 24-31.
- Patterson, R. S. (1989). Forward. In *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education. University of Alberta.
- Patterson, R. S. (1989). Analysis of task force and study team reports. In *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education. University of Alberta.
- Pearson, A. et al. (1989). Task forces on mission, goals, and priorities--final report. In *Exploring and mapping the future: a focus on priority issue*. Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education. University of Alberta.

- Pedersen, K. G., & Fleming, T. (1981). The academic organization and continuing education. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, 7 (2), 4-9.
- Perkins, J. A. (1973). *Organizations and organizational theory*. Boston: Pitman.
- Peters, J. P. (1979). Four challenges to effective long-range planning. *Trustee*, 46, 25-27.
- Peters, T. (1987). *Thriving on chaos*. New York: Knopf.
- Peterson, M. W. (1980). Analyzing alternative approaches to planning in Jedamus, et al., *Improving academic management: a handbook of planning and institutional research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and organization theory*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Quinn, J. B. (1980). Managing strategic change. *Sloan Management Review*, 21(3), 3-20.
- Redinbaugh, L. D., & Redinbaugh, D. E. (1983). Theory Z management at colleges and universities. *Educational Record*, 64, 26-30.
- Roach, E. D. (1988). West Texas State University in *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, Steeples D. W. (ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Sapp, M. M. (1987). *Strategic Planning: what's it really like?* AIR 1987 Annual Forum Paper. Kansas City.
- Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. (1973). *Field research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schendel, D. E., & Hatten, K. J. (1972). *Strategic planning and higher education: Some concepts, problems, and opportunities*. Purdue University.
- Shirley, R. C. (1988). Strategic planning: an overview. In *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, Steeples, D. W. (ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Sibley, W. M. (1986). Strategic planning and management for change. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 16 (2), 81-102.
- Simerly, R. G. (1987). *Strategic planning and leadership in continuing education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Small, J. M., Konrad, A. G., Hassen, M. R., & Pickard, B. W. (1976). *Renewal in post-secondary institutions: an analysis of strategies*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Smith, M. E. (1987). Change and innovation in higher education: a role for corporate strategy? *Higher Education*, 16, 37-52.
- Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. *Educational Research*, 7, 5-8.

- Stake, R. E., & Easley, J. (1978). *Case study in science education*, Vol. 2. Design overview and general findings. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Starbuck, W. (1983). Organization as action generators. *American Sociological Review*, 91-102.
- Steeple, D. W. (1988). *Successful strategic planning: case studies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Steiner, G. A. (1979a). *Strategic planning: what every manager must know*. New York: The Free Press.
- Steiner, G.A. (1979b). *Strategic planning*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sun Tzu, (1988). *The art of strategy*. (Translated by R. L. Wing). New York: Doubleday
- Swain, D. C. (1988). The University of Louisville. In *Successful strategic planning: case studies*, Steeples, D. W. (ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Tabatoni, P. and Jarniou, P. (1976). The dynamics of norms in strategic management. In Ansoff, H.I., Declerck, R.P. & Haye, R.L. (eds.), *From strategic planning to strategic management*. New York: John Wiley.
- Tack, M. W., Rentz, A., & Russell, R. L. (1984). Strategic planning for academic programs: A strategy for institutional survival. *Planning for Higher Education*, 12 (4), 8-14.
- Tack, M. W., & Heberlein, G. T. (1986). Linking strategic planning and graduate education. *Planning for Higher Education*, 14 (4), 3-13.
- Thomas, D. R. E. (1978). Strategy is different in service business. *Harvard Business Review*, 56, 158-165.
- Thomas, R. (1980). Corporate strategic planning in a university. *Long Range Planning*, 13, 70-78.
- Uhl, N. P. (1983). Using research for strategic planning. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- University of Alberta. (1987). *Draft policies: the next decade and beyond*. Edmonton, Ab: University of Alberta.
- Van Manen, M. (1984). Practicing phenomenological writing. *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*, 2(1), 36-59.
- Verstegen, D. A., & Wagoner Jr., J. L. (1989). Strategic planning for policy development: an evolving model. *Planning and Changing*, 20(1), 33-49.
- Walter, S. (1984). *Thinking Strategically*. Washington, D.C.: The Council of State Planning Agencies.
- Weick, K. E. & Daft, R. L. (1983). The effectiveness of interpretation systems. In Cameron, K. S. & Whetten, D. A. (eds), *Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models*. New York: Academic Press.

- Weick, K. E. (1985). The significance of corporate culture. In Frost, P., Moore, L., Louis, M., Lundberg, C., & Martin, J. (eds.), *Organizational culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Wheelen, T. L., & Hunger, J. D. (1984). *Strategic Management*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Williams, D. D. (1986). When is naturalistic evaluation appropriate? *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, (30), 95-92.
- Winstead, P. C. (1982). Planned change in institutions of higher learning. In *New Directions for Institutional Research: Effective Planned Strategies* edited by G. Melvin Hips. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wood, D. R. Jr. (1980). Long range planning in large United States banks. *Long Range Planning*, 13 (3), 91-97.
- Wood, K. L., & Wood, S. H. (1981). *Are corporate strategic planning techniques useful in public higher education?* Paper present at the joint Conference of the Southern Association for institutional Research and the North Carolina Association for Institutional Research, Charlotte, North Carolina.
- Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: design and methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organization*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Appendix 1: Gaining Entry

7-104 Education North
Department of Educational
Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB. T6G 2G5

Sept. 25, 1989.

Dear _____ :

I am presently undertaking a study on the process of strategic planning in the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta for my doctoral dissertation in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta.

The purpose of this research is to investigate, describe, and explain the strategic planning process whereby the Faculty of Education designed and implemented its Strategic Planning Project. This is qualitative research which uses the case study method including documentary review and interviews. All the relevant data will be collected by reviewing documents and by interviewing faculty members of the Faculty of Education and other stakeholder groups.

I am writing to seek your consent to participate in one interview for this study. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes to one hour and will be tape-recorded. All responses will be treated with complete confidentiality. However, your cooperation is needed to make this study a success.

I sincerely hope you will agree to participate in this study. Thank you for considering this request. I am looking forward to your possible earliest reply so as to make an appointment with you at a convenient time. My phone number is: 492-3094 (Office); 469-3309 (home). I'll contact you very soon.

With my best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Wang, Jinhua

Appendix 2: Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, _____ HEREBY agree to participate as a volunteer in the "Process of the Strategic Planning in the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta" study.

I hereby give permission to be interviewed and for the interview to be tape-recorded. I understand that at the completion of the research project the information may be published. For example, direct quotations from the interview may be used at the researcher's discretion.

I understand that my identity will not be disclosed at any time, and that at the end of the project the tape recordings will be erased. During the study the tapes will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home.

I will be reviewing a copy of the researcher's interpretation of the interview for accuracy. I further understand that I may withdraw from the study, or refuse to answer any item in the interview schedule.

I am free to ask the researcher any questions which I may have regarding this study, until these questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant Signature

Date: _____

Researcher Signature

Date: _____

Appendix 3: Preliminary Interview Guide

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Background Information

1. Respondent's Department
2. Number of years at this institution

Questions

1. When and how did you first hear of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project (FESPP)?
2. What were your first reflections on the FESPP ?
3. Why do you think the Faculty initiated the FESPP?
4. How have you been involved in the FESPP? When? In what phases? Response to the Dynamics of Diversity? To be interviewed? Issues feedback forums? Did you discuss with others about these processes?
5. What were your reactions to these processes?
6. Beside these, were there other strategies used to get faculty members involved in the FESPP?
7. What are your reflections on the process used in the FESPP?
8. What did your colleagues respond to the process of the FESPP?
9. What are your reflections on the report "Exploring and Mapping the Future"?
10. How did the Faculty choose people to work for the FESPP?
11. What are the major procedures for designing the FESPP?
12. How were issues and problems facing the Faculty identified?
13. How were the goals and mission statement of the Faculty formulated?
14. How were issue resolutions generated?
15. What was the action plan?
16. What was the evaluation and feedback system of the FESPP?
17. What strategic planning model did the FESPP follow?

18. How were stakeholder groups involved in the FESPP? In what phases? For what purposes?
19. What role did the Dean play in the FESPP?
20. What role did the Coordinators play in the FESPP?
21. What role did the department chairmen of the Faculty play in the FESPP?
22. What role did the Faculty of Education Council play in the FESPP?
23. What role did the stakeholder representatives play in the FESPP?
24. Can you predict any change in the structure, culture, programs of the Faculty from the FESPP?

Appendix 4: Chronology of Events

EVENTS OF THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING PROJECT IN A CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Fall, 1985:

- Dean began to think about the possibility of having a Faculty Review like the PACCR Review of the departments.
- Dean talked with the previous Dean of the Faculty of Education on a couple of occasions about whether this kind of study (PACCR) was useful to the Faculty.
- Dean asked three faculty members to prepare a proposal for the Faculty Self-Study.

Nov. 1985:

- Faculty of Education Self-Study Proposed Design prepared by three faculty members.

Feb. 1986

- Modification of the Faculty of Education Self Study Proposed Design.
- Revised Proposal was submitted to the Dean and was discussed several times with the Dean.

April, 1986:

- Dean asked two faculty members as Coordinators to head up the Self Study.
- Self Study was changed into Faculty of Education Planning Study by the two Coordinators.

May, 1986:

- Dean took this planning proposal to the Faculty of Education Council for information.
- Setting up the structure of the Planning Study.

June, 1986:

- Design of the Current Status and Trends Study.

July, 1986:

- Dr. McIntosh began to collect data for the Current Status and Trends Study and to conduct 30 interviews external and internal of the Faculty.

Sept., 1986:

- Report to the Faculty of Education Council about the Planning Project by the Coordinators.
- Faculty Planning Study was reannounced by the Dean at the FEC.
- Dr. Hrynyk began to review the literature on issues in the teacher education.

Dec. 1986:

- FESPP Progress Report: Dec. 2/86.
- Newsletter #1 : FESPP Procedures.

Jan. 1987:

- Faculty of Education Planning Study was changed into Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Study by Dr. Ingram (Coordinator).

Feb. 1987:

- The Current Status and Trends Study Report *The Dynamics of Diversity* was distributed.
- Report on Issues in Teacher Education was distributed.
- Selecting 18 Interviewers to interview faculty members.
- Interview Orientation Seminars for interviewers.

Mar. 1987:

- Newsletter #2: The Schedule of Activities of the remainder of the FESPP was presented.
- Interview Guide was distributed to all the faculty members for getting feedback from the Faculty members on *The Dynamics of Diversity*.

April, 1987:

- Interviewing 150 Faculty members.

May, 1987:

- John Lawrence: Summaries of Interviews Conducted in Developing *The Dynamics of Diversity*- Prepared for the use of the Issues Identification Panel.
- Ingram & Worth: Report of Interviews with Faculty members: A Working Paper for the Issues Identification Panel.
- Issue Identification Seminar: June 18 and 19, 1987.

Oct. 1987:

- Newsletter #3: Charting the course and next steps.
- Issue Identification Feedback Forums: Oct. 26-29.
- Issues Facing the Faculty of Education prepared by Ingram and Worth was distributed.
- Issues and Orientations: Issues Facing the Faculty of Education, How They were Identified, and Orientations to Their Resolution prepared by Ingram and Worth.

Dec. 1987

- Issues Identification Feedback Forums: A Report prepared for Task Forces and Study Teams prepared by Ingram and Worth.
- Terms of Reference for Task Forces and Study Teams prepared by Ingram and Worth.

Jan. 1988:

- Letter to the department chairs asking for the members of Task Forces and Study teams.
- Newsletter #4: Task Forces and Study Teams and procedures.
- Newsletter #5: Members of Task Forces and Study Teams.
- Task Force Timeline.

April, 1988:

- Two task forces and two study teams started to work.
- Alternative Mission Statements for the Faculty of Education distributed by Pearson to members of the Faculty of Education.
- Discussions on the Mission Statements: April 26-27.
- Task Force on Teacher Education Models.
- Study Team on Organizational Structure and Procedure.
- Study Team Graduate Studies and Research.

May, 1988:

- Seminar for Task Forces and Study Teams: providing feedback, exchanging information, and considering interrelatedness of issue identification.

Oct. 1988:

- Faculty Members' Views of Selected Aspects of Work and Reward Structures prepared by Miklos, et al..
- Newsletter #6: Action Alternatives.

Dec. 1988:

- Task Forces and Study Teams' Reports submitted.

Feb. 1989:

- Final Report: *Exploring and Mapping the Future: A Focus on Priority Issues: A Report on Alternatives for Issues Resolution by the FESPP.*
- Newsletter#7: The Time for Action.

June 1989:

- Former Project Coordinator made recommendations to the Dean in regard to the Feedback on the *Exploring and Mapping the Future*.

Oct. 1989:

- Faculty of Education Council Meeting on the Report of the Task Force on Mission, Goals and Priorities.

Nov. 1989:

- Faculty of Education Council Meeting on the Report of the Task Force on Teacher Education Models.

Appendix 5: Letter Concerning Member Check

7-104 Education North
Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB. T6G 2G5

July, 1990

Dear _____ :

You may remember that I interviewed you last year concerning the process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project for my doctoral dissertation in the Department of Educational Administration. Thank you again for allowing me to interview you. The information that you provided is greatly appreciated.

Now I enclose a description of the topics/reflections which emerged from 25 interviews including yours. Would you please read it over to make sure it includes your major ideas and/or the perspectives of your colleagues. If there are comments, modifications, and additions, I would appreciate it if you would make note of them and return it to the above address at your earliest convenient time.

Many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Wang, Jinhua
Doctoral candidate

Appendix 6: Topics/Themes from Interviews

Topics/Themes Emerged from 25 Interviews on the Process of the Faculty of Education Strategic Planning Project

Reasons

- impact of University planning process
- to build Faculty level commitment
- reaction to external, social, political, demographic pressures
- to obtain comprehensive overview of the Faculty
- to enhance Faculty image with external agencies
- to provide rationale for resources allocation
- to develop sense of mission and purpose for Faculty
- as impetus for change

Design

- drafted by three Faculty members
- based on Dean's prior experiences
- adaptation of PACCR
- not linked to financial planning
- evolutionary model
- strategic planning--pragmatic, current, democratic term: adapted not adopted
- not strategic planning, but planned change
- term not understood by Faculty

Structure

- Dean removed from decision-making
- Dean was front for Coordinators
- department chairs not heavily involved
- separated from formal Faculty structure
- project had low profile/visibility
- Faculty newsletter irregular information device
- Faculty decline in enthusiasm for Project

Process

a) The Current Status and Trends Study

- descriptive data base, not analytical
- highlighted demands, limitations, and problems
- public relations document
- internal review well done, external review inadequate

b) Literature Review: Issues in Teacher Education

- to provide guidance/sources of information
- to act as stimulus for environmental scan

c) Faculty interviews

- way of getting faculty members involved.
- to compare faculty views on the Dynamics of Diversity
- did not always include all issues

d) Issue Identification Feedback Forums

- seen as window-dressing/symbolic involvement
- some faculty concerns excluded
- lack of response
- way of generalizing issues

e) Task Forces and Study Teams

- took too long
- little Faculty involvement
- mission/goals:
 - * not influenced by Dean
 - * little impact on daily decision-making
 - * unlikely to obtain consensus of Faculty
 - * should reflect faculty members' vision and orientation

- Teacher Education Models:

- * only a beginning
- * models need faculty consensus

f) Exploring and Mapping the Future

- critical activity for future
- merely collection of position papers
- lacks specific, concrete recommendations/directions
- lacks future vision
- does not reflect the major identified issues
- does not fit the University planning

g) Action Planning

- greater involvement of Dean, task force leaders, Department chairs, and stakeholder groups needed
- should be linked directly to formal structure of Faculty
- greater Faculty interests encouraged
- continuous process/evolutionary model proposed
- lacks impetus for change
- faculty less likely to be involved
- doubtful outcome
- university context, tradition, and culture make change unlikely
- individualistic not communal